In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

58

The Śaiva Religion among the Khmers
Part I

Alexis SANDERSON *

The primary religion of the Khmers is now Theravāda Buddhism, as it is throughout mainland Southeast Asia with the exception of sinicized Vietnam; but the rise of that religion occurred only with the decline and fragmentation of the Khmer kingdom of Angkor and the concomitant growth of the power and influence of the Tai, who had adopted the Theravāda from the Mon of Dvāravatī and lower Burma. Our records of the Khmer principalities of the fifth to eighth centuries and of the unified kingdom of Angkor that emerged thereafter and endured into the fourteenth, show that religion throughout that time comprised three other faiths of Indian origin: Śaivism, the Pāñcarātrika Vaiṣṇavism of the Bhāgavatas, and Mahāyāna Buddhism in the developed form that includes the system of ritual and meditation known as the Mantranaya, Mantrayāna or Vajrayāna. The three coexisted harmoniously for the most part but with Śaivism predominant. This was so throughout ancient Kambujadeśa, the area of Khmer settlement that extended southeast through modern Kampuchea from the Angkor region north of the Great Lake into the delta of the Mekong river in southern Vietnam, and to the north, through north-eastern Thailand [1] and the Champasak province of southern Laos. [2]

* Spalding Professor of Eastern Religions and Ethics, All Souls College, University of Oxford.

1. The remains of nearly two hundred Khmer temples of the Angkorean period survive in modern Thailand in the provinces of Chanthaburi, Sa Kaeo, Prachin Buri, Nakhon Ratchasima, Buri Ram, Surin, Si Sa Ket, Ubon Ratchathani, Yasothon, Roi Et, Maha Sarakham, Khon Kaen, Chaiyaphum, and Sakon Nakhon, with the greatest concentrations in Nakhon Ratchasima, Buri Ram and Surin.

2. I have chosen to use the term Kambujadeśa to avoid confusion with the modern state of Kampuchea or Cambodia. Kambujadeśa or Kambuja is the name given to their territory by the Khmers in their Sanskrit and Old Khmer inscriptions of the Angkorean period: K. 14, v. 3; K. 235, Khmer, C l. 72; K. 258 C, v. 2; K. 278, v. 2; K. 282 D, v. 23; K. 549, l. 12–13; K. 956, l. 16. They also show the form Kambudeśa (*kamvudeśa*) and synonyms: K. 300, v. 9; K. 400 B, v. 2; K. 923, v. 14; K. 806, v. 270a (*kambuviśvambharā*). These names were understood through a tradition that the Khmer kings are the descendants of a mythical progenitor Svāyambhuva Kambu (K. 286, v. 11 sqq.), i.e. as 'the land of the sons of Kambu' or 'the land of Kambu'. In Middle Khmer we find *kāmbūj*, *kambūjdes*, *kāmbūjdes* (K. 465 of A.D. 1583 [*NIC* I: 22]), in Modern Khmer *kambujā*/Kampuchea/, and in Old Javanese *kamboja* (*Deśawarṇana* 15.1). The earliest occurrence of the word of which I am aware is in A.D. 817. It occurs in Campā, the rival kingdom to the east of Kambujadeśa, in a Sanskrit inscription of king Harivarman I at the Po-Nagar temple (C. 2 = M. 26): *ākambujārdham ajitabhujaujasā* 'one the might of whose arm was unconquered right up to the middle of Kambuja[deśa]'.

Perhaps there was no sense of any such comprehensive entity in the pre-Angkorean period. Running through the kingdoms of mainland Southeast Asia, the *Da Tang Xiyu ji* of Xuanzang (= Taishō 2087), completed during that period, in A.D. 646, calls the kingdom between Dvāravatī (*dolobodi*) to the West and Mahācampā (*mohojenbo*) to the East not Kambujadeśa or similar, as we might expect, but Īśānapura (*yishangnabulo*) (BEAL 1884, 2:200). This is the name of the capital (= Sambor Prei Kuk) of the

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

The same configuration of religions held sway elsewhere in Southeast Asia. We find it to the east of the Khmers in Champa (*campā*), the confederated principalities of the Chams that occupied the coastal region and highlands of Cochin-China from the fifth century until the seventeenth.[3] It was much diminished by progressive Islamicization after the retreat of the capital to the Phan-rang (Pāṇḍuraṅga) area in the South in the wake of the capture and destruction of Vijaya (Binh-Dinh) by the Vietnamese in 1471.[4] But the king remained a follower of the old tradition until at least 1607[5] and elements of it survived into modern times among the 'Brahmanist' Chams.[6] There are signs of its presence in the Minangkabau region of Sumatra in the fourteenth century,[7] and in the kingdom of

---

dominant principality of the period, named after its founder Īśānavarman I (r. 616/7, 627–*c.* 635). The Chinese referred to the early southern coastal kingdom as Funan. Thereafter, from the seventh century onwards they referred to the land of the Khmers (*gemie*) as Zhenla (**Ts'iĕn-lâp*). The origin of neither term is known. I have seen no reference to the region or its people in any pre-modern Indian source.

I write here by invitation, and do so aware that my competence is limited. As a Sanskritist working on the history of Śaivism I have come eventually to look beyond the Indian subcontinent to other regions in which this religion took hold, and this has led me to the inscriptions of the Khmers. But I have relied entirely on published transcriptions. I have not worked directly from the inscriptions themselves or from rubbings, squeezes, or photographs. Furthermore, I have very unequal competence in the two languages of the inscriptions, Sanskrit and Old Khmer, my knowledge of the latter being a superficial acquaintance that relies heavily on the translations of George CŒDÈS, Claude JACQUES and Saveros POU, and on the *Dictionnaire vieux khmer-français-anglais* of the last. I offer my own translations throughout, but where I have ventured to disagree with these scholars, I have not done so out of a superior sensitivity to the nuances of Old Khmer, but rather because I have felt that the subject and context demand an alternative within what I have thought with less than authoritative judgement to be the range of possible meanings. I am greatly indebted to my colleague Professor Gerdi Gerschheimer of Paris for encouraging me to undertake this work in spite of these deficiencies, for helping me to do so by providing a number of copies and photocopies of important epigraphical sources and studies and for saving me from many errors through his meticulous reading of my manuscript. I am grateful also to Dr Arlo Griffiths of the University of Groningen for reading my manuscript and detecting a good number of misprints and other errors.

3. These principalities were centred in the string of coastal plains facing the South China Sea located, from north to south, in (1) the Binh-Tri-Thien area, (2) Quang-Nam and Quang-Ngai provinces (My-Son; capital Indrapura [Tra-kieu]); (3) Binh-Dinh province (capital Vijaya [Do-Ban or Cha-Ban], (4) Khanh-Hoa province (Kauṭhāra; capital Kauṭhāra [Po Nagar, Nha-Trang]), and (5) Phan Rang and Phan Ri provinces (Pāṇḍuraṅga; capital Pāṇḍuraṅgapura). In the Sanskrit inscriptions of this region and that of the Khmers the land of the Chams and the various peoples of the highlands is called Campā or Campādeśa. In the inscriptions of the Khmers the Chams themselves are known as the Cāmpas: K. 273, v. 67 (Skt.); K. 1036 (*NIC* II–III, 149–155) (Khmer).

4. See PO DHARMA 2001 (14–27) for an excellent up-to-date summary of knowledge of the history of Champa up to its demise in the first half of the nineteenth century.

5. See the report of Cornelis MATELIEF in 1608 cited by REID (1993, 187). The mass of the Chams were Muslim by the 1670s, including the king (MANGUIN 1979, 269–71).

6. See AYMONIER 1891, CABATON 1901, MUS 1933.

7. Chinese, epigraphical and material evidence indicates that the powerful thalassocracy of Śrīvijaya ruling from Palembang from the seventh century to the thirteenth was Mahāyāna-Buddhist. It was followed by the kingdom of Malāyu, first centred in Jambi and then, by the beginning of the fourteenth century, on the west coast. Malāyu, unlike Śrīvijaya, was in close contact with Java, which achieved ascendancy of this region from the late thirteenth century. This led to the introduction of Majapahit's Śaiva-Buddhist religious culture. In 1284 the king of Malāyu received a composite statue consisting of copies of deity-statues from the Buddhist temple Caṇḍi Jago in East Java sent to him by king Kṛtanagara of Majapahit, an event recorded on the back of the statue in an Old Malay inscription (DE CASPARIS and MABBETT 1992, 321). King Ādityavarman of Malāyu (r. *c.* 1347–79), who had spent his early years in Majapahit, is described in his Surasao inscription as a follower of the esoteric Buddhist

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

Kutai in the central region of the east coast of Kalimantan (Borneo).[8] It prevailed in East Java from the eighth century until the Muslim forces of Demak crushed Majapahit in about 1527, eliminating the last remaining major Śaiva-Buddhist court of the region, and in West Java until those of Banten conquered the Sundanese court of Pajajaran in 1579.[9] It clung on into the eighteenth century in the kingdom of Blambangan on Java's Eastern Salient, and perhaps even within the Islamic kingdom of Mataram in the Central Javanese heartland.[10] It is still intact among the Balinese of the neighbouring islands of Bali and Lombok; and some of its Śaiva practices and liturgies survive in Java itself, among the priesthood of a cluster of isolated communities in the Tengger highlands to the east of Malang,[11] a survival that suggests that when Islam began to make its inroads Śaivism was not merely the religion of the courts but had put down deep roots in rural society, at least in some parts of Java.[12]

---

cult of Hevajra (Satyawati SULEIMAN 1977 cited in DE CASPARIS and MABBETT 1992, 321). But there is also an impressive fourteenth-century statue, 4,41 m in height, of a two-armed Bhairava standing on a corpse, said to have been found at Sungei Langsat (SCHNITGER 1937, plates 13–16; CŒDÈS 1968, 243, claiming that it is an image representing Ādityavarman), and there is a set of fourteenth-century sculptures from Palembang in which Śiva is flanked by Brahmā and Viṣṇu reproduced in SOEBADIO 1992, 120–121.

8. Śaivite and Buddhist statues have been found in a cave at Gunung Kambeng; see FONTEIN 1990, 25, citing BOSCH 1925. The stone statue of Śiva, which conforms to the Javanese iconographical type (samapāda, holding a trident, a rosary, a fly-whisk, and showing the gesture of boons) has been reproduced in SOEBADIO 1992. Kutai is the site of the earliest Sanskrit inscriptions of maritime Southeast Asia, those of Mūlavarman in the late fourth or early fifth century associated with a shrine of a [Śiva] Vaprakeśvara (CŒDÈS 1968, 52). Its rulers probably maintained their Śaiva-Buddhist religious culture until they were converted to Islam in 1568.

9. REID 1993, 2:212–213.

10. See RICKLEFS 1993, 366–367, n. 74 and REID 1993, 2:149, 173–186 on the slow progress of Islam in Java, especially among the Javanist (*kejawen*) ruling elites, and the superficiality of its adoption by the lower orders of society. The Kartasura *Babad ing Sangkala* (Chronicle of the Chronograms) composed before about 1670 (RICKLEFS 1993, 2) first mentions Muslims only in 1577–78, recording their defeat of Śaiva-Buddhist Kaḍiri; and we have a Dutch report of 1598 that Javanese Muslims were found only on the north coast and that the people of the interior were all heathen (REID 1993, 2:173–174). Blambangan was under the control of the Śaiva-Buddhist kingdoms of Bali, first Buleleng and then, from 1711, Mengwi (RICKLEFS 1993, 161). As evidence of Śaiva-Buddhist survivals in Mataram RICKLEFS (1993, 366-367) notes that the Dutch East India Company reported superstitious heathen (supertitieuse heydenen) in Mataram in 1743. For the survival of some isolated Śaiva-Buddhist religious communities see also PIGEAUD 1967, 54.

11. On the religion of the Tengger communities see HEFNER 1985. He reports (1985, 8) that at the time of his research there were some twenty-eight priests in a like number of village units comprising some 40,000 people living at altitudes between 1400 and 2000 metres, somewhat shielded from Islamicization by the fact that the massive expansion of the population of Java during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries (from around 5 million in 1800 to around 100 million at present) and the consequent migration into less populous areas largely passed them by, since these villages are above the altitude at which sugar and coffee can be cultivated (HEFNER 1985, 31–33). Tengger communities in the lower villages and in the nearby towns (Malang, Pasuruan, Probolinggo and Lumajang) have been converted to Islam (ibid.).

12. HEFNER 1985, 9.

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

The Sources

Our evidence for these three religions in Kambujadeśa up to the fall of Angkor, as for all other aspects of its history, consists primarily of inscriptions. More than a thousand have been discovered and published, engraved on stone stelae, image-pedestals, and the jambs of temples, written in Sanskrit verse, in Khmer prose, or commonly in both. The great majority belongs to the period from the last quarter of the ninth century, some seventy-five years after the beginning of the Angkorean kingdom, down to its end. For the first part of the Angkorean period we depend mostly on dubious information in later inscriptions, and before that only the seventh century is well represented, by some two hundred contemporary records.

In all periods these epigraphs record the establishing or restoration of temple-deities, temples, hermitages and other pious foundations by royalty, high dignitaries and local leaders, their endowments consisting of land, slaves (*khñuṃ*, Skt. *dāsaḥ*) to work that land and to serve as cooks, musicians and the like, livestock, ritual implements and other valuables, or the settlement of title disputes concerning these, and the allocation of revenues (*kalpanā*) for purposes such as the funding of specific recurrent ceremonies and the subsistence of religious officiants and other staff. They commonly introduce these practicalities with eulogies of the monarch and his ancestors, and also of the donor himself if other than the king, eulogies which sometimes contain information on matters of interest to the historian of religion, such as accounts of other pious works of the donor, the history of priestly lineages and their relations with their patrons through appointment to religious, administrative and other offices, rituals performed or sponsored, and in rare instances, the names of the textual authorities followed in these performances.

In addition we have the evidence of a great wealth of material culture in the form of the remains of religious edifices, images of their deities, ritual objects, and bas-reliefs showing scenes from the Indian epics and the life of the population. The sheer number of the Khmer's temples, the vast scale of the greatest of them, and the inscriptions that detail their endowments, reveal that the creation and support of such foundations was central to the economic, cultural and political life of the whole society. They channelled and promoted agricultural production, engaging a very substantial proportion of the region's human and material resources, they integrated the realm, and they legitimated the tenure of land and power.[13]

No non-epigraphical texts remain from the pre-Angkorean and Angkorean periods, other than a few short Chinese reports redacted in later compendia and a Chinese memoir of 1296–97 written by Zhou Daguan, who spent eleven months in Angkor with an embassy sent by Temür Öljeitü, the second Mongol emperor of China. None of these throws much light on the Khmers' religions. For the literature that sustained and expressed them, in the form of sacred texts, commentaries, handbooks of ritual, and temple archives, was transmitted in palm-leaf manuscripts, which cannot survive long in the hot and humid climate of Southeast Asia.[14] Once the information they contain had lost its relevance with the decline of Angkor and the rise of Theravāda Buddhism there would have been no reason to preserve it by making new copies.

13. HALL 1985, 136–138, 160–161.

14. The region of Angkor has a monsoon climate. It rains on average on more than half the days of the five months from May to October, with annual rainful in recent years averaging 1,410 mm. Temperatures climb above 35°C in April and May and fall to a little over 30°C at the end of the year. Relative humidity fluctuates between 60 percent and 80 percent (ACKER 1998, 7; NESBITT 1997, 32). Documents on palm-leaf are unlikely to survive long in such conditions.

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

Though all local manuscripts of pre-Theravādin times have perished, manuscripts of some of the Sanskrit texts that the Khmers' inscriptions identify as guiding their ceremonies in the Angkorean period do survive in the Indian subcontinent. In the case of Śaivism these works were primary authorities in India only in the early period during which the form of the religion they teach was introduced among the Khmers. Not long after that they were followed in the subcontinent by a second wave of texts propagating a simplified system of Śaiva observance that rendered them largely irrelevant. This early obsolescence would no doubt have led to their complete disappearance, were it not that the Kathmandu valley has a temperate climate that has enabled a few manuscripts to survive there from the ninth and tenth centuries, when these changes had not yet occurred or, at least, had not yet affected this rather isolated region. By studying these and related sources we have a means of adding to our knowledge of Khmer religion.

Scripture and Paddhati

However, common sense and the character of the Indian Śaiva literature must alert us to the naïvety of assuming that these works can reveal more than the general parameters within which some elements of local practice would have operated. They are texts of scripture (*āgamaḥ*, *tantram*, *saṃhitā*) and as such were designed to be accepted as authorities by the widest possible constituency. To that end they tend to prescribe only the bare framework of practice, thereby allowing for the great variety on the level of detail and ancillary elaboration that can be observed in the practical manuals (Paddhatis) that guided the procedures followed by religious officiants in specific regions and lineages.

The Khmers too had their manuals setting out the procedures to be followed in the worship of their deities. A Khmer inscription of A.D. 1306 from Banteay Srei (Īśvarapura) refers to such a text:

> *qnak varṇna khnar grāṅ nā vraḥ kamrateṅ añ pre paṃre ta vraḥ kamrateṅ añ ru devatākṣetra sap anle nusāra śloka praśasta vraḥ pāñjīy kṣetropacāra*
>
> *khnar grāṅ* corr. : *khnar graṅ* POU • *nusāra* corr. : *nu sāra* POU
>
> K. 569 (ed. POU 2001, 166–171), ll. 17–19

> The personnel of the corporation of Khnar Grāṅ at [the temple] of the goddess are commanded to serve the goddess as [is done] in all [other] deity-sites, following (*nusāra*) the verses of the ordinances (*śloka praśasta*) of the Sacred Manual (*vraḥ pāñjīy*) on the Procedure for Worship at Sacred Sites (*kṣetropacāra*).[15]

15. POU translates the last phrase as follows: "suivant en cela les stances du saint registre relatif au domaine". For Khmer Skt. *upacāraḥ* in the meaning '[ritual] service' see K. 254, v. 8: *devadvijopacārārtham* 'to serve the gods and brahmins'; K. 258 C, v. 10: *agryopacārair* 'with fine offerings'.

The Sanskrit term *pañjī*, *pañjikā* from which the Khmer form *pāñjīy* is derived is used in Indian sources to denote both written records or registers, such as those that priests keep of their clients, and guides to ritual (Paddhati). An example of the latter is the *Pañjikā* of Brahmaśambhu, a Paddhati on the Śaiva rituals composed in A.D. 938. Thus in the *Naimittikakarmānusandhāna*, f. 54r3: *prakāśito yam arthātmā pañjikopāyato mayā*. 'I have clarified this topic by means of the *Pañjikā*'; f. 31r3–4: *prapañcaḥ sakalo py asya nityakarmasamuccaye / nirddiṣṭaḥ pañjikāyāṅ ca teneha na pratanyate* 'I have taught the full elaboration of this in the *Nityakarmasamuccaya* and the *Pañjikā*'. Similarly in *Jayadrathayāmala*, Ṣaṭka 1, f. 197v8–9: *kriyā vā deśikendreṇa vyākhyeyā pañjikāgatā* 'or else the Guru should explain the ritual [as set out] in the *Pañjikā*'. I am very grateful to Mr. Guy Leavitt of the University of Chicago, who went to the trouble of obtaining a microfilm of the *Naimittikakarmānusandhāna* manuscript for me in Calcutta.

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

and an inscription of the reign of Udayādityavarman II (1050–1066) reveals in a eulogy of his predecessor, the devout Śaiva king Sūryavarman I (r. *c.* 1002–1050), that the latter had composed one or more such works:

> *śivapūjāviśeṣo pi śāstroktaś śrutamātrakaḥ*
> *dhiyā viracito yasya śivāṅśasyākhilocitaḥ*
> K. 661, v. 61
>
> And being a born devotee of Śiva (*śivāṃśasya*) he was able by virtue of his intelligence to compose a fully appropriate [manual for] an excellent ritual of Śiva worship taught in [Śaiva] scripture as soon as he had heard it [expounded in that source].[16]

16. CŒDÈS misunderstood the verse as follows (*IC* 1:213; my trans. and parentheses): "The least particulars of the worship of Śiva (*śivapūjāviśeṣo 'pi*), prescribed by the treatises (*śāstroktaḥ*) or only transmitted orally, were entirely understood (*akhilocitaḥ*) only when they had been redacted (*viracito*) by the wisdom (*dhiyā*) of this (king) (*yasya*) who was a portion of Śiva (*śivāṃśasya*)". His rendering of *śivapūjāviśeṣo 'pi* is contradicted by the singular number. There is nothing in the verse that justifies his "or". The compound *śrutamātrakaḥ* (= *śrutamātraḥ* with the stem-extending suffix *-ka-* for the sake of the metre) has been wrentched from its common idiomatic sense, that is to say "merely heard" in the meaning "as soon as heard". For the use of Bahuvrīhis in *-mātra-* after a past participle passive in this sense see, e.g., RENOU 1984, 117. The Śāstra(s) of *śāstroktaḥ* are more naturally understood as the Śivaśāstra(s), i.e. the Śaiva scriptures. This is the normal sense in Śaiva works, where it is not, as in Buddhist usage, used to refer to works of scholarship as opposed to scripture. "Entirely understood" cannot be the meaning of *akhilocitaḥ*, which must mean either "entirely appropriate" or, less probably, "appropriate to all".

As for *śivāṃśasya*, which CŒDÈS understood as a Tatpuruṣa compound meaning "a portion of Śiva", it is rather to be understood as a Bahuvrīhi meaning "whose *aṃśaḥ* is towards Śiva". In Śaiva terminology a compound formed of the name of a deity followed by the word *-aṃśaḥ* means a devotee of that deity, more precisely a person with a natural inclination (*aṃśaḥ*) towards that deity rather than another. This can be seen in a passage of the *Kiraṇa* in which it teaches three versions of the postmortuary Śrāddha ritual, calling them the Śivaśrāddha, the Rudraśrāddha and the mundane (*laukikam*) Śrāddha. The first is for the benefit of Śaiva initiates (*dīkṣitāḥ*), the second for that of *rudrāṃśāḥ*, and the third for that of brahmins who are neither (f. 95r2–4 [61.6–10b]): *īśas sadāśivaḥ śānto deśikatritayam bhavet / sādhaka*dvitayaṃ* (em. : *tṛtayaś* Cod.) *cānyad rudrānantam iti sthitam / tṛptaiḥ tair nikhilan tṛptaṃ śivāntam abhavat khaga / dīkṣitānāṃ śivaśrāddhaṃ rudrāṃśānān tadātmakam / tatra caṇḍamahākālau dvau gaṇau dvitaye sthitau rudraḥ skando *gaṇeśo 'nyas* (em. : *gaṇeśānyat* Cod.) *tritaye saṃsthitās tv ime / tapasvibhiḥ dvijaiś cātra rudraśrāddham prakalpayet / kurvvanti ye narā bhaktyā rudralokam vrajanti te / laukikaṃ brahmaviṣṇvīśa*sūryāntakavikalpitam* (em. : *sūryāntikavikalpitam* Cod.) and (f. 96r5–v1 [61.34–36]): *śrāddham evaṃvidhaṃ śaivaṃ śivasāyojyadam param / rudraśrāddhaṃ svanāmāṅkaṃ praṇavādi namontikam / rudrasāyojyadañ caiva devatānāṃ svasaṃjñayā / kṛte smin laukike śrāddhe *narakaṃ na sa* (conj. : *navamāsyaṃ sa* Cod.) *paśyati / viprāṇāṃ vihitaṃ śrāddham vedoktaṃ smṛtikalpitam / brahmalokam avāpnoti tatkartā dvijasattamaḥ*. That *rudrāṃśaḥ* means 'devotee of Rudra/Śiva' (*rudrabhaktaḥ*, *śivabhaktaḥ*) here is evident from its occurrence elsewhere in the same passage. Three balls of rice (*piṇḍāḥ*) are to be put out in a line in the course of the Śrāddha. If the wife of the person commissioning the ceremony (the *kartā*) desires a son she should eat the one in the middle. She will then, we are told, give birth to one who will grow up to be a *rudrāṃśaḥ* (f. 96r4 [61.31]): *putrārthaṃ vanitā śuddhā madhyamaṃ piṇḍam āpnuyāt / tadā tasya naro dhīro rudrāṃśaḥ strīyuto bhavet*. That this was understood to mean "devotee of Rudra/Śiva" is apparent from the parallels of this passage seen in the *Bṛhatkālottara* (f. 196v1: v. 57c) and the *Kriyāsaṃgrahapaddhati* of Vāladhārin (f. 111v2–3). For there the son is described respectively as *śāṅkaraḥ* 'a devotee of Śaṅkara' (*janayec chāṅkaraṃ putraṃ*) and *śivabhaktaḥ* 'a devotee of Śiva' (*jāyate dhanavān putraḥ śivabhaktaḥ suśīlavān*). Furthermore, the triad initiate (*dīkṣitaḥ*), *rudrāṃśaḥ* and ordinary brahmin identified as the beneficiaries of the three kinds of Śrāddha is parallelled in this same passage by the triad initiate, *rudrabhaktaḥ* and ordinary brahmin, where these are those who may, in order of

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

śivārccanāgnihotrāditapasyāsādhanāni yaḥ
mantratantrāṇi saṃśodhya vidhaye rañjayad dhiyā
K. 661, v. 74

Intelligently redacting the Mantras and rites that accomplish the worship of Śiva, the fire-sacrifice, other [rituals], and ascetic practice, he clarified them for ritual application.

and:

yuktam ukto maheśo yas tapasyāsādhanaṃ vidhim
sādhūkṛtya kṛtodyogair yogibhir yyad akārayat
K. 661, v. 76

He was aptly called the Great Lord (/Śiva) since he removed errors from the procedure for the practice of asceticism and then saw to it that it was followed by determined meditators.

Similarly, early in the reign of Jayavarman II (r. 802–*c.* 835), in connection with the foundation of the united Khmer kingdom of Angkor and the inauguration of the royal cult of the Devarāja (Kamrateṅ Jagat ta Rāja), a brahmin called Hiraṇyadāma is said to have extracted the essence of the four primary sources of the Vāma division of the Śaiva scriptural canon (*vāmasrotaḥ*), works concerned with the special rites and observances of Tumburu and his sisters:

jayavarmmamahībhṛto mahendrā-
vanibhṛnmūrddhakṛtāspadasya śāstā
kavir āryyavarāṅgavanditāṅghriś
śivakaivalya iti pratītir āsīt

hiraṇyadāmadvijapuṅgavo gryadhīr
ivāvjayoniḥ karuṇārdra āgataḥ
ananyalavdhāṃ khalu siddhim ādarāt
prakāśayām āsa mahībhṛtaṃ prati

sa bhūdhareṇānumato grajanmā
sasādhanāṃ siddhim adikṣad asmai
hotre hitaikāntamanaḥprasattiṃ
saṃvibhrate dhāmavivṛṅhaṇāya

śāstraṃ śiraśchedavināśikhākhyaṃ
saṃmohanāmāpi nayottarākhyam
tat tumvuror vaktracatuṣkam asya
siddhyeva vipras samadarśayat saḥ

---

diminishing preference, be invited to receive the offerings in the Śivaśrāddha (f. 95r6 [61.11cd]): *sādhakaputrakābhāvād rudrabhaktā *dvijāthavā* (Aiśa for *dvijā athavā*) 'In the absence of Sādhakas or Putrakas [the recipients] may be [lay] devotees of Rudra or [ordinary] brahmins'. Finally, see *Niśvāsaguhya*, f. 42v1–2 (1.8 ff.), defining the *brahmāṃśaḥ*, the *viṣṇvaṃśaḥ*, and the *rudrāṃśaḥ*. The section on the last is mostly lost through damage to the codex but the other two are defined in a manner that supports my interpretation. The first is said to be one who is ever eager to study the Vedas, who accepts the Upaniṣadic doctrine of the Self, and who aims to reach the paradise of Brahmā (*brahmalokaṃ sadākāṅkṣan*), while the second is said to be ever eager to meditate on Viṣṇu (*viṣṇudhyānarataḥ sadā*) and to aspire to enter his paradise (*viṣṇusāyojyakāṅkṣiṇaḥ*). Of the first line of the two-line definition of the *rudrāṃśaḥ* we have only the last four syllables, in which he too is said to be ever devoted (*rataḥ sadā*), presumably to the meditation or worship of Rudra (*rudradhyānarataḥ sadā* / *rudrapūjārataḥ sadā* or similar). The first half will probably have referred to his desire to reach the paradise of Rudra, perhaps *rudralokaṃ sadākāṅkṣan*.

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

dvijas samuddhṛtya sa śāstrasāraṃ
rahasyakauśalyadhiyā sayatnaḥ
siddhīr vvahantīḥ kila devarājā-
bhikhyāṃ vidadhre bhuvanarddhivṛddhyai
K. 235, vv. 25–29

King Jayavarman, who had made his residence on the summit of Mount Mahendra [Phnom Kulen], had as his teacher a poet called Śivakaivalya, whose feet had been honoured by [contact with] the heads of [prostrating] Āryas.[17] Hiraṇyadāma, an excellent brahmin, like Brahmā himself in his great wisdom, being moved by compassion came and with due respect revealed to the king a Siddhi which no other had attained. To increase [the king's] splendour this brahmin, with the king's permission, taught the Siddhi and the means of achieving it (*sasādhanām*) to that offerer of the [king's] sacrifices, [knowing that he was one] whose tranquil mind was devoted entirely to [his monarch's] welfare. The Brahman revealed to him as though by means of [this] Siddhi the four faces of Tumburu that are the scriptures *Śiraścheda*, *Vināśikha*, *Saṃmoha* and *Nayottara*, and in order to increase the prosperity of the realm he carefully extracted the essence of [those] texts through his mastery of the esoteric [teachings] and [with it] established the Siddhis that bear the name Devarāja.[18]

This 'essence' (*sāraḥ*) that Hiraṇyadāma extracted is evidently a manual for practical application, a Paddhati or Pañjikā, since we are told that after extracting it he proceeded to install the powers known as the Devarāja. The point must be that he redacted a Paddhati for this purpose on the basis of those scriptures.

It might be objected that if the 'essence' were a manual of ritual procedure then learned Indian tradition dictates that it should be claimed that it is based not on four texts but on one, a Paddhati, literally 'a pathway', being a practical manual that guides the performer of a ritual by co-ordinating the Mantras and actions taught explicitly or implicitly in the various parts of a single scripture, setting them out explicitly in the order of their performance and utterance, supplementing them from related scriptures only where the silence of the primary source requires it.[19] However, the account of the events

17. The meaning of the term *ārya-* is uncertain. It could mean a person of North India, an inhabitant of Āryadeśa, a sense that is found in Old Javanese inscriptions; see ZOETMULDER 1982, s.v. *ārya*, *karṇataka*, *kēliṅ*, and *draviḍa*, and the inscription of Kaladi, 7b1–2 (BARRETT JONES 1984, 186), where they are distinguished from the people of Kaliṅga, Śrīlaṅkā, Karṇāṭas, Draviḍas etc. However, it may have been used here, as also in Old Javanese, to refer to powerful persons of noble birth; see ZOETMULDER 1982, s.v. *ārya* and ROBSON 1995, 139 ad *Deśawarṇana* 81.3–4.

18. Tumburu is indeed four-faced; see, e.g., *Vīṇāśikha* 96b–97b: *tumburuṃ karṇikopari / padmāsanopaviṣṭaṃ tu varadānodyatakaram // caturvaktram aṣṭabhujaṃ*. The four texts are these four faces in the sense that they are thought to have been uttered by them, by analogy with the well-known tradition that Sadāśiva's five faces are the sources of the five streams of the Śaiva revelation: the Siddhānta from the upper, the Vāma from the left-facing, the Dakṣiṇa from the right-facing, the Gāruḍa from the front-facing, and the Bhautika from the rear-facing.

19. *Sārdhatriśatikālottaravṛtti* p. 45, ll. 6–7: *paddhatiḥ pratiśāstraṃ vikṣiptasya śrutasya *tatsāmarthyākṣiptasya* (em.: *tatsāmarthyāt kṣiptasya* BHATT) *ca mantratantrānuṣṭhānāya *saṃkṣepāt* (em.: *saṃkṣepa* BHATT) **krameṇābhidhānaṃ* (em.: *krameṇābhidhānād* BHATT) *yajurvedādau yajñasūtrādivat* 'For any scripture a Paddhati is a text which enables the performance of the rituals [of that scripture] along with the Mantras [that accompany them] by succinctly arranging in the order [of performance] (i) the [instructions] explicitly stated [in that scripture but] dispersed in various places

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

connected with the installation of the Devarāja in the Khmer portion of the same inscription, removes this anomaly:

> *man vrāhmaṇa jmaḥ hiraṇyadāma prājña siddhividyā mok aṃvi janapada. pi vraḥ pāda parameśvara añjeñ thve vidhi leha leṅ kam pi kamvujadeśa neḥ āyatta ta javā ley. leṅ āc ti kamrateṅ phdai karoṃ mvāy guḥ ta jā cakravartti. vrāhmaṇa noḥ thve vidhi toy vraḥ vināśikha pratiṣṭhā kamrateṅ jagat ta rāja vrāhmaṇa noḥ paryyan vraḥ vināśikha. nayottara. saṃmoha. śiraścheda. syaṅ man svat ta mukha cuṅ pi sarsir pi paryann steṅ añ śivakaivalya nu gi.*
>
> K. 235, Khmer, C ll. 71–75

> Then a brahmin called Hiraṇyadāma, who was learned in the Mantras that bestow Siddhi, came from Janapada. The Venerable Parameśvara [the late Jayavarman II] requested him to perform a ritual in order that this land of Kambuja (Kambujadeśa) should not continue to be a dependency of Javā and so that only one king should be universal ruler [in this region]. That brahmin performed the ritual [for those ends] following the venerable *Vināśikha* and established the Kamrateṅ Jagat ta Rāja (= Devarāja). The brahmin [then] taught the *Vināśikha*, the *Nayottara*, the *Saṃmoha* and the *Śiraścheda*. He recited them from beginning to end so that they could be written down, and taught them to Steṅ añ Śivakaivalya.

It is clear from this that the 'essence' of those four Vāma scriptures was not a hybrid but a Paddhati based on one of them. This text, called the *Vināśikha* here, is evidently the *Vīṇāśikha/Vīṇāśikhātantra* that survives in a single Nepalese palm-leaf manuscript. It is widely attested in Indian sources as one of the principal Vāma scriptures[20] and presents itself in its opening verses as the culmination or essence of the Vāma revelation already given in the other three texts.[21]

It does not teach a ritual specifically for the purposes of independence and political unity indicated in the inscription, but then nor does any Śaiva text known to me. One would expect that Hiraṇyadāma simply wrote these aims into the prose formula of intention (*saṃkalpaḥ*) that any text of worship must contain when enacted for the benefit of the worshipper or his client,[22] perhaps choosing the ninth day of the lunar fortnight

---

[throughout its length], and (ii) whatever [else] those explicit statements imply. An example is the *Yajñasūtra* in the case of the [Kāṭhaka] Yajurveda'.

20. The error in the Khmer report of the title is certainly that of the composer of the inscription rather than the engraver or editors, since it also appears in the Sanskrit, where the metre requires the short syllable provided by the erroneous *vi-*. It should be remembered that the inscription was composed in A.D. 1053, some two hundred and fifty years after the installation it reports. It is only too likely that by then the Paddhati based on the *Vīṇāśikha* was all that had survived of the Vāma literature and that the original title had become distorted.

21. *Vīṇāśikha* 4–10. Note that in v. 12 it refers to its configuration of mantras/deities (Yāga) as the essence of the Tantras, by which it means those of the Vāma division: *yāgam ādau pravakṣyāmi tantrasāraṃ sudurlabham / *yenaiva* (em.: *tenaiva* Cod. and GOUDRIAAN) *varadā devyo nityaṃ devi bhavanti hi* 'I shall first teach you the Yāga, the essence of the Tantras, so hard to find, by means of which, O goddess, the [four] goddesses will constantly grant one's desires'.

22. The formula is to express the intention in an adverbial compound ending in *-artham* 'for the purpose of'. For example, in the *Svacchandabhairavakramamahāsarvaśāntividhānam*, f. 3v9, we see *amukaśāntyarthaṃ baliṃ gṛhna* 'Accept the bali for the averting [of ills] from N' and in the *Rudraśānti* section of the same manuscript we see in f. 19r6: *dvīpamārīmahotpātaśāntyarthaṃ mṛtyuñjayāya sarvapūjitāya namaḥ* 'Obeisance to Mṛtyuñjaya worshipped by all for the averting of the great disaster of disease throughout the land'; and in f. 19r9–v1: *mahāmṛtyuñjaya mahājanakṣayapraśāntyarthaṃ deśotpātamahāmārībhayaśāntyarthaṃ baliṃ gṛhna* 'Great Mṛtyuñjaya accept the bali for the averting of

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

(*navamī*) for the ceremony on the authority of the *Vīṇāśikha*, which rules that a king who seeks victory over his enemies should have the worship of the deities of this text performed on that day.[23]

The *Vīṇāśikha* also lacks instructions on the procedures for the installation of images (*pratiṣṭhā*). But that too would not prevent the *Vīṇāśikha* from being taken as the basis of a Paddhati composed for that purpose, since to select a scripture for a Paddhati is only to select its system of Mantras, its configuration of deities (*yāgaḥ*) and other basic constants. With these in place it is a simple matter to add any rituals such as those of installation that it happens not to cover but that are essential components of any Śaiva system. We see exactly this in the surviving mainstream Paddhatis of the Indian Saiddhāntika Śaivas, nearly all of which are Paddhatis of the *Kālottara* in its two-hundred verse redaction, a text which says nothing of installation.[24]

We cannot assume, then, that references in Khmer inscriptions to rituals as following certain scriptural sources enable us to access the nature of those rituals in any detail where those sources happen to have survived. The Paddhatis that guide and reflect actual practice though claiming to be based on such texts draw only their framework from them. They are obliged to fill this in and extend its application by drawing extensively on other sources if they are to contain comprehensive prescriptions capable of governing the whole range of rituals that the faithful require.

Nor should we assume that the inevitable supplementation would have been limited to closely related sources. Śaiva theoreticians require this and argue against eclectic syncretism. But their argument is a conservative attack on an established practice. Thus the Kashmirian Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha (*fl. c.* 950–1000)[25] decries a tradition of incorporating the procedures of the *Svacchanda* into worship based on the *Mataṅga* on the grounds that the two texts belong to separate streams of the Śaiva revelation, the former being a text of the Dakṣiṇa or Bhairava division and the latter one of the Saiddhāntika division:

> *yena tv atra etacchāstrakramaṃ vihāya svatantrapaddhatikrama ullikhitaḥ sa svacchandam upekṣaṇīya eva. yato yatretikartavyatā na śrūyate tatrākāṅkṣābalāt saṃhitāntaratas tadapekṣā yuktā na sarvatra anavasthiteḥ. ity uktam: kriyādi-bhedabhedena tantrabhedo yataḥ smṛtaḥ. tasmāt tatra yathaivoktaṃ kartavyaṃ nānyatantrataḥ iti. tatrāpi svasrotasa evaikasrotopadeśarūpatvena saṃnikarṣāt na*

---

destruction from the whole community, for the averting of national disaster, of the peril of fatal epidemic disease'. Similarly, in the text of the Śaiva postfunerary *Gopradānavidhi* of Kashmir the worshipper is made to say that he is about to worship the gods listed in the formula *ātmanaḥ puṇyavṛddhyarthaṃ vāṅmanaḥkāyopārjitapāpanivāraṇārthaṃ pituḥ rudrasya paralokapuṇyavṛddhyarthaṃ śivapadavī-prāptyarthaṃ* (f. 7v) 'for the increase of my own merit, for the removal of the sins that I have acquired through word, mind and body, for the increase of merit of the Rudra who is [my deceased] father in the next world and for [his] reaching the path of Śiva'.

23. *Vīṇāśikha* 17: *saṃgrāme vijayārthī vā pararāṣṭra*vimardane* (conj.: *vimardanam* Ed.) / *navamyāṃ *pārthivo* (em.: *pārthivaṃ* Ed.) *yāgaṃ kurvīta bhaginīpriyam* 'Alternatively if a king desires victory in battle, [or] intends an assault on the kingdom of an enemy, he should perform the ceremony of worship dear to the Sisters on the ninth day [of the month]'.

24. All the major early Saiddhāntika Paddhatis that have survived are based on the *Dviśatika-Kālottara*: the *Paddhati* of Brahmaśambhu (*Brahmaśambhupaddhati*) (938 A.D.), the *Siddhāntasārapaddhati* of Bhojarāja (r. 1018 to 1060), the *Kriyākāṇḍakramāvalī* of Somaśambhu (*Somaśambhupaddhati*) (1095/6), the *Kriyākramadyotikā* of Aghoraśiva (1157/8) and the *Jñānaratnāvalī* of Jñānaśiva (second half of the twelfth century). Only one Saiddhāntika Paddhati survives that is based on another scripture. That is Aghoraśiva's *Mṛgendrapaddhati*, which, as its name reveals, is a Paddhati of the *Mṛgendratantra*. But his purpose in this work is evidently not to promote an alternative model for the Saiddhāntika ceremonies.

25. For my grounds for this dating see GOODALL 1998, xiii–xviii.

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

srotontarataḥ ata eva viprakarṣād viruddhānuṣṭhānaprasaṅgāc cety uktam asmābhir anyatra: na ca śāstrāntare kartuṃ yuktaṃ śāstrāntaraśrutam.

1-2 *sa svacchandam* em. : *svacchandam* BHATT

Mataṅgavṛtti ad KP 5.11

One may freely disregard the [teacher] who has introduced the procedure of the Paddhati of the *Svacchandatantra* at this point. This is because it is proper to supplement a scripture by drawing on another only where a procedure is not explicitly stated [but evidently required]. In such cases one may draw on another scripture, because one is forced to do so by the incompleteness [of the base-text]. But one may not do so in all cases, because that would remove all consistency. This is why we have the text 'Tantras are distinguished from each other through their differences in the domains of ritual (*kriyā*) [, meditation practice (*yogaḥ*)] and [observance (*caryā*)]. So one must follow the instructions of that [scripture which one has adopted] and not those of any other system.' Moreover, even then (*tatrāpi*) [, when one is obliged to supplement its information from another source, one should do so] from [a scripture of] one's own division of the Śaiva canon, that being the closest since it has the nature of instruction within one and the same stream of revelation. One may not do so from any other division [such as that of the *Svacchandatantra*], because it is too remote from that and because this would lead to the undesirable consequence of the presence of practice of a contrary nature [within Saiddhāntika Śaivism]. That is why I have taught: 'It is not proper in [the practice of] one scripture to do what has been taught in another.'[26]

But the Paddhati *Siddhāntasāra* composed by Mahārājādhirāja Bhojadeva, probably the Paramāra king of that name who ruled from Dhārā in modern Gujarat from A.D. 1018 to 1060, shows that the influence of the *Svacchanda* was too great to be withstood. For though his Paddhati is based on the two-hundred-verse redaction of the *Kālottara*, a Saiddhāntika scripture, it has drawn extensively on the three and a half thousand verse Dakṣiṇa *Svacchanda*, though without acknowledging the fact, especially in its treatment of the rituals of initiation. Indeed large parts of his Paddhati are little more than a prose redaction of passages of that scripture.[27] The influential Saiddhāntika Paddhati of

26. See also Aghoraśiva, *Mṛgendrapaddhati*, p. 1, and Vaktraśambhu, *Mṛgendrapaddhativyākhyā* ad loc.

27. Compare, for example, *Svacchanda*, f. 25r4–v4 (3.163–174) with *Siddhāntasārapaddhati* f. 20v3–21r2. After each verse section of the first I have placed the corresponding prose section of the second in square brackets. The prose passages form a continuous text. 163 *pāśakarmam ato vakṣye kanyākartitasūtrakam / triguṇaṃ triguṇīkṛtvā pāśabandhanasūtrakam* / 164 *śivāmbhasāstra saṃprokṣya kanyākartitasūtrakam / triguṇaṃ triguṇīkṛtvāstraprokṣitaṃ kavacāvaguṇṭhitaṃ sampūjya*] / 165 *gṛhya prasārayet sūtraṃ sūtraṃ triguṇaṃ triguṇīkṛtyāstraprokṣitaṃ kavacāvaguṇṭhitaṃ sampūjya*] / 165 *gṛhya prasārayet sūtraṃ mūrdhnādyaṅguṣṭhayāvadhi / śiṣyasya stabdhadehasya nāḍībhūtaṃ vicintayet* [→ *śiṣyasyordhvakāyasya mūrdhnādyaṅguṣṭhayāvadhi / śiṣyasya stabdhadehasya nāḍīrūpaṃ vicintya*] / 166 *suṣumnā śikhāyāṃ baddhvā pādāṅguṣṭhāgrāt tam avalambya suṣumnānāḍīrūpaṃ vicintya*] / 166 *suṣumnā madhyamā nāḍī sarvanāḍīsamanvitā / oṃkārādisvarūpeṇa namaskārāvasānikam* [→ OṂ SUṢUMNĀYAI NAMAḤ] / 167 *śiṣyadehe sthitā nāḍī saṃgṛhya viniveśayet / gandhapuṣpādibhiḥ pūjya kavacenāva-guṇṭhayet* [→ *ity anena śiṣyadehāt suṣumnāṃ saṃgṛhya sūtre saṃ*(29v)*yojya saṃpūjya kavacenāva-guṇṭhya*] / 168 *saṃnidhāne trir āhutyas svanāmapadajātinā / śivāmbhāstreṇa saṃprokṣya śiṣyasya hṛdaye punaḥ* / 169 *puṣpeṇa tāḍaye 'streṇa hṛdi cit saṃhṛtā bhavet* [→ *sannidhānāhutitrayaṃ dadyāt. tataḥ śiṣyahṛtpradeśe saṃyojya puṣpāstreṇa hṛdi saṃtāḍya*] / *huṃkāroccārayogena recakena viśed dhṛdi* / 170 *nāḍīrandhreṇa gatvā tu* [→ *recakaprayogena huṃkāraṃ samuccaran nāḍīmārgeṇa hṛdi tasya sampraviśya*] *caitanyaṃ bhāvayec chiśoḥ / kadambagolakākāraṃ sphurattārakasaprabham* / 171 *hṛtsthaṃ chidyāstrakhaḍgena huṃphaṭkārāstrajātinā / dhāmenāṅkuśabhūtena karṣayed yāva chaktitaḥ* [→ *śiśoś caitanyaṃ sphurattārakākāraṃ hṛdy astreṇa saṃcchidya mūlamantreṇa samākṛṣya*] / 172 *dvādaśānte ca saṃgṛhya saṃpuṭitvā hṛdā tu tam / saṃhāramudrayā yojya sūtre nāḍiprakalpite* [→ *dvādaśānte hṛdayasaṃpuṭitaṃ kṛtvā* OṂ HĀṂ HAṂ HĀṂ *saṃhāramudrayā saṃgṛhya sūtre saṃyojya*] /

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

Somaśambhu completed in central India in A.D. 1095/6 perpetuates this tacit fusion since it is in large part a verse redaction of Bhojadeva's prose;[28] and it is taken forward into the Saiddhāntika Paddhatis of the Tamils Jñānaśiva and Aghoraśiva, the first composed in Benares and the second in the far South in the second half of the twelfth century, both authors who would have been abashed had they realized that their 'pure' Saiddhāntika tradition had been hybridized in this way.

Our understanding of Indic ceremonial traditions has tended to be dominated by the model of the archaic Vedic (Śrauta) sacrifice, which has come down through the centuries in a remarkably stable and uncontaminated form. The Śaivas too wished their traditions to be seen in this light and at every stage have denied, or would have denied, that they were innovating, insisting that they were faithfully preserving the tradition of a specific ancient scripture, supplementing its instructions from ancillary sources only where absolutely necessary and with the understanding that they were doing so in accordance with an intention implicitly conveyed by that scripture, thus avoiding all syncretism. We have now seen that this model fails to stand up to analysis even in the domain of the private worship required of individual initiates for their own benefit, where we might expect that reasons for innovation would have been less compelling since such worship was comparatively free of market forces. But in the domain of worship performed by professional priests for others, such as we encounter in the Khmers' inscriptions, the pressures to depart from the

---

173 *vyāpakaṃ bhāvayitvā tu kavacenāvaguṇṭhayet / trir āhutiṃ bhairaveṇaiva saṃnidhānārthahetave* [→ *vyāpakaṃ saṃbhāvya kavacenāvaguṇṭhya saṃnidhānārthaṃ mūlamantreṇāhutitrayaṃ juhuyāt*] / 174 *dvitīyasūtradehaṃ tu pāśā yatra sthitās tv ime / badhyāś chedyās tathā dāhyāḥ sūtrasthā na tu vigrahe* [→ *tāḍanādīni ca pāśānāṃ sūtre kuryāt, na śarīra iti*].

28. Compare, for example, the section of the *Siddhāntasārapaddhati* cited above with *Somaśambhupaddhati* 3:169–183 (vv. 5–13). See also *Siddhāntasārapaddhati* ff. 23r–v (B) with the corresponding continuous passages of *Somaśambhupaddhati* 3:3–13 (vv. 1–13) in square brackets: *atha dīkṣāsvarūpanirūpaṇam* [→ 1 *athāto bhogamokṣārthaṃ dīkṣārūpanirūpaṇam / yathāgamaṃ yathābodhaṃ saṃkṣepād abhidhīyate*]. *tatra bandhahetumalakarmamāyādipāśaviśleṣo jñānaṃ cānugṛhyasya yayā kriyayā janyate sā dīkṣā* [→ 2 *malamāyādipāśānāṃ viśleṣaḥ kriyate yayā / jñānaṃ ca janyate śiṣye sā dīkṣety abhidhīyate*]. *tatrānugrāhyas trividhaḥ vijñānākalaḥ pralayākalaḥ sakalaś ceti* [→ 3 *vijñānākalanāmaiko dvitīyaḥ pralayākalaḥ / tṛtīyaḥ sakalaḥ śāstre 'nugrāhyas trividho mataḥ*]. *tatra malamātrayukto vijñānākalaḥ. malakarmayuktaḥ pralayākalaḥ, kalādipṛthivyantatattvayuktaḥ sakalaḥ* [→ 4 *tatrādyo malamātreṇa yukto 'nyo malakarmabhiḥ / kalādibhūmiparyantatattvais tu sakalo yutaḥ*]. *dīkṣāpi dvividhā niradhikaraṇā sādhikaraṇā ca* [→ 5 *nirādhārā ca sādhārā dīkṣā tu dvividhā matā*]. *tatrācāryanirapekṣeṇa bhagavatā svaśaktyānugraharūpayā tīvrataraśaktinipātena yā kriyate sā niradhikaraṇā, vijñānākalapralayākalānāṃ* [→ 6 *ācāryanirapekṣeṇa kriyate śambhunaiva yā / tīvraśaktinipātena nirādhāreti sā smṛtā*]. *yā tv ācāryamūrtisthena bhagavatā mandamandataratīvratīvratararatīvratararatīvrataratīvrataratīvrata

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

purists' model would surely have been much greater. We should consider it very probable that the Paddhatis that guided their ceremonies among the Khmers were freely modified over time to appeal to or satisfy the expectations of new clients, such as immigrant brahmins patronized by the court or an incoming dynasty with its own traditions of worship for the protection of the king and the state.

Anyone who doubts this need only examine the relationship between scripture and Paddhati throughout the Indic world. I shall consider three examples, from Kashmir, Nepal and Bali. These are cultural zones which received their Śaivism independently. Features that they share are therefore very unlikely not to have been found in their common source and, moreover, in other zones that received the religion, such as Kambujadeśa. Readers whose interest is purely Khmerological may wish to skip the rest of this subsection, moving directly to the next section (p. 377).

Kashmir

The Paddhatis used by the Śaiva officiants of Kashmir until recent times, notably the *Kalādīkṣāpaddhati* and the *Agnikāryapaddhati*, are based on the scriptures *Svacchandatantra* and *Netratantra*. Study of those scriptures and their learned commentaries written by the Kashmirian Kṣemarāja (*fl. c.* 1000–1050 A.D.) leads one to assume that their ritual systems, being distinct in their Mantras, deities and other defining particulars, would be kept distinct. But we find that they are fused in these manuals within single ceremonies, and that this hybrid is further elaborated through the insertion of the worship of numerous subsidiary deities drawn from various sources, some of them local goddesses such as Śārikā, Rājñī and Jvālāmukhī, and others drawn from mainstream traditions, such as Mālinī, Kubjikā, Tripurasundarī, and, from the Kalpas of the *Jayadrathayāmala*: Nityākālī, Pāpāntakāriṇī, Bhāgyādhirohiṇī, Bhuvanamālinī (Dīkṣādevī), Mantraḍāmarikā, Mantramātṛkā, Vāgīśvarī, Vāgbhaveśvarī, Vidyāvidyeśvarī, Saptakoṭīśvarī and Siddhalakṣmī.[29]

Further, there are distinct redactions of these texts which differ from each other in the presence or absence of the worship of certain deities or in following different sources for their worship. Thus the version of the *Agnikāryapaddhati* in a Paris manuscript adds the East-Indian Śākta deities Tārā, Bhuvaneśvarī, Bhadrakālī, Dakṣiṇā Kālī, Bagalāmukhī and Vajrayoginī to the goddesses who receive oblations in the Śaiva fire-sacrifice,[30] deities that are no part of early Kashmirian tradition and are lacking both in a Göttingen manuscript's version of this Paddhati and in the corresponding section of the fire-worship that ends the ceremony of Śaiva initiation in the Kashmirian *Kalādīkṣāpaddhati*.[31]

29. See SANDERSON 2002, 2 and 22–23 (endnote 19) for a full list of the goddesses who receive offerings in the fire-sacrifice that is a regular constituent of the Paddhatis of the Kashmirian Śaiva officiant (*gōryum*). The seats (Pīṭhas) of the local Kashmirian goddesses listed are as follows: (1) Śārikā: in Śrīnagar on the NW side of the hill Hāraparbuth (Skt. Śārikāparvata, also called Pradyumnaśikhara); (2) Rājñī (/Khīrbhavānī): at Tulamul (Skt. Tūlamūlya); and (3) Jvālā/Jvālāmukhī: on a spur at Uyen (Skt. Ovanā) / Khruv (Skt. Khaḍūvī). They and Bālā, whose seat is under a Deodar tree at Bālahōm (Skt. Bālāśrama) to the NE of Pāmpar (Padmapura), are the family goddesses (*kuladevī*) of the Kashmirian brahmins (*Devīrahasya*, introd., p. 2). For the presence of these goddesses at these sites see STEIN 1961, 2:459 (Bālā), note on 1.22 (Jvālāmukhī), note on 4.638, and 2:446–447 (Śārikā), and 488 (Rājñī). For their fairs (*utsavaḥ*) see KOUL 1991, 85–97. The antiquity of these local goddesses is uncertain. Śārikā at least was already venerated in the eleventh century since she is mentioned in the Kashmirian *Kathāsaritsāgara* of Somadeva (reign of Kalaśa, 1063 and 1081/2); see 73.107–118. Paddhatis for the worship of these four goddesses have been published as supplements (*pariśiṣṭāni*) to the *Devīrahasya*.

30. These goddesses are covered in ff. 80r5–84v8 of the Paris manuscript.

31. *Kalādīkṣāpaddhati*, A, ff. 220r1–227r12.

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

Dakṣiṇā Kālī, who is the foremost of these East-Indian goddesses, has also been added in the Paris version, together with Bhadrakālī, among the deities summoned to protect the Yāga;[32] and the same two have been included among the goddesses in one version of the Paddhati of the *Annapūrapūjā* of the Śaiva Śrāddha ceremony (*śivaśrāddham*).[33] Similarly, in the *Kalādīkṣāpaddhati*, first composed in A.D. 1335/6 by one Manoda but expanded and modified until at least the end of the seventeenth century,[34] we find two redactions that differ in their sub-Paddhatis, one incorporating East-Indian tradition, the other not, for the preliminary worship of Gaṇeśa and the goddess Pustakavāgīśvarī.[35]

I propose that these intrusive East-Indian elements were the result of the incorporation into Kashmirian brahmin society of the family stocks (*krām*) that share the name Kaul. They claim to be Kashmirians who moved from the Kashmir valley to Darbhanga in the eastern state of Bihar (Mithilā) in order to escape Islamic persecution during the reign of Sikandar (1389–1413) and then returned when conditions had improved during the reign of Zain-ul-abidin (1419, 1420–70). But there are compelling reasons to conclude that they

32. F. 27r–v. Dakṣiṇā Kālī (/Dakṣiṇakālī) is the principal Kālī venerated in Bengal (BANERJI 1992, 180). Her dark lolling-tongued form, four-armed, her left hands brandishing a sword and holding a severed head, and her right hands showing the gestures of protection and the bestowing of boons, standing on the prostrate body of Śiva and surrounded by jackals, is held by tradition to have been revealed to the famous Bengali Śākta Kṛṣṇānanda Āgamavāgīśa Bhaṭṭācārya of Navadvīpa (BANERJI 1992, 91), author of the *Tantrasāra*, composed *c.* 1580 (ibid.). She appears in such East-Indian Śākta scriptures as the *Kulacūḍāmaṇitantra* (4.39–47); *Toḍalatantra* (1.3–4, 18), *Pheṭkāriṇītantra*, Paṭala 10, *Guptasādhanatantra*, Paṭala 6, *Niruttaratantra* cited in *Karpūrādistotraṭīkā* p. 2, 3–11, *Viśvasāratantra* cited ibid., p. 4, 13–16; and *Mahākālasaṃhitā*, (*Kāmakalākhaṇḍa*) 241.4.

33. *Annapūrapūjā* f. 15r4–v3 (Dakṣiṇakālī), 15v3–16v3 (Bhadrakālī). The published version of this Paddhati has only Bhadrakālī (CHANDRA 1984, 212a–218b, *śivaśrāddhe 'nnapūripūjā*). The visualization-text (*dhyānam*) of Dakṣiṇakālī in the manuscript (f. 15r5–12) is closely related to that of the East-Indian *Pheṭkāriṇītantra*, 10.4c–12.

34. The date of the work's original composition and its subsequent expansion are recorded at its end (MS B, f. 111v8–10): *ayaṃ svahṛdayodbhavagirīśaśaktipātakramāc caturvidhaguṇānvitaḥ pravara-dīkṣyaśiṣyocitaḥ manodaguruṇombhitaḥ khaśaśisaṃjñake vatsare prabhāv udayane maṇer nijasutasya karmoccayaḥ / iti mahāmāheśvaramanodadattaviracito 'yaṃ dīkṣāvidhiḥ śivasvāmivistārito bhadradāyī samāpto 'bhavat* 'This compendium of rites, which is endowed with the four good qualities and is suitable for the best of disciples worthy of initiation, has been composed for his son Maṇi by the Guru Manoda during the reign of Udayana, in the year 10, inspired by the descent of Śiva's power that has arisen in his heart. Here ends this beneficent Ceremony of Initiation, composed by Mahāmāheśvara Manodadatta and expanded by Śivasvāmin.' Udayanadeva ruled Kashmir from 11 Pauṣa Laukika [43]99 (A.D. 1320) to 13 badi Phālguna (Śivarātri) Laukika [44]14 (A.D. 1339). In support of these dates see PARMU 1969, 84, n. 44. The year 10, then, can only be 4410 of the Laukika (Saptarṣi) era, since that was A.D. 1335/6. In the other era used by Kashmirian brahmins, that of the beginning of the Kaliyuga, the year 10 fell too early, [44]10 being A.D. 1308/9. We have no information that enables us to date the expander Śivasvāmin or to determine whether he is one of the Śivasvāmins known from other sources or another. The latest addition to the text that I can recognize is in MS A. This gives the *Bhairavastotra* of Rājāna[ka] Śaṅkarakaṇṭha (f. 200r5) and the *Śambhukṛpāmanoharastotra* of his son Rājānaka Ratnakaṇṭha (f. 201v13–15) among hymns to be chanted after the consecration ceremony (*abhiṣekaḥ*) that follows the *dīkṣā*. Ratnakaṇṭha's *Stutikusumāñjalilaghupañcikā* is dated Vikrama 1738, = A.D. 1681/2 (p. 256).

35. Redaction 1 = MS A, ff. 2r6–5r12; Redaction 2 = MS B, ff. 1v3–2v3 and MS C, ff. 1v4–2v16. For its worship of Gaṇeśa B follows East-Indian tradition (= *Āgamarahasya, Uttarārdha* 855–860) and for the worship of Pustakavāgīśvarī it combines that tradition (= ibid. 865–867b) with a Kashmirian tradition incorporating *Jayadrathayāmala*, Ṣaṭka 4, *pustakādhikārapaṭalaḥ*, ff. 209r4, 209r5–7 (= vv. 21c–22b, 24–26).

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

were Maithila brahmin immigrants from that region and that they conceived this story of return to support their assimilation.

An anonymous Kashmirian Sanskrit tract of the Islamic period reports that the brahmins of Kashmir, who have often claimed to be all Sārasvatas, are actually Sārasvatas, Maithilas, Kānyakubjas, Drāviḍas, Gauḍas, Autkalas and Gurjaras. Now it says that those Kashmirians who are Maithilas are distinguished from all others by the fact that their Gotra division is the Dattātreya.[36] Since this is the Gotra of the Kauls and of the Kauls alone, at least in Kashmir,[37] we are being told that the Kauls are Maithilas and therefore that they are of East-Indian origin, since the term could never be applied to brahmins who had merely spent some years in Mithilā, the region from which the Maithilas derive their name.

This conclusion is confirmed from within the Kaul community itself. For we have verses in two nineteenth-century Kashmirian manuscripts of collectanea of devotional works and liturgical texts of their tradition, in which an anonymous Kaul reveals not only that he belongs to the Dattātreya lineage but also that he is a Maithila and a Yajurvedin of the Mādhyandinaśākhā and the Kātyāyanaśrautasūtra—the Maithila brahmins of Bihar are indeed either Mādhyandina Yajurvedins or Kauthumaśākhīya Chandogas[38]—and that his original home (*pūrvabhūmiḥ*) was in the land of Janaka, where Sītā was born, on the banks of the Kolā river, that is to say, in northern Bihar at or near Sītāmarhi, about fifteen miles south of the modern Nepalese border.[39] The Kauls' presence there may explain the names of two villages in the vicinity: Madhkaul and Dhankaul.[40]

36. *Brāhmaṇādijātīyakavarṇana* p. 1[11], ll. 13–16: *sārasvatā bharadvājā dattātreyāś ca maithilāḥ / *gārgyavātsyāḥ* (em. : *gārgyavātsya* Cod.) *kānyakubjā drāviḍā aṅgirahkuśāḥ / mūlatuṣṭā vasiṣṭhāś ca mudgalā maudgalās tathā / *gauḍajās te* (conj. : *gauḍajā ete* Cod.) *samākhyātā gautamā aupamanyavāḥ / mudgalidrāviḍāś caiva *kiṣkindhādeśa* (corr. : *kiṣkindā* Cod.) *āgatāḥ / kaśyapā *gurjarāḥ* (corr. : *gūrjarāḥ* Cod.) *khyātāḥ parāśarās tathaiva ca* 'The Bharadvājas are Sārasvatas, the Dattātreyas are Maithilas, the Gārgyas and Vātsyas are Kānyakubjas, the Aṅgirases and Kuśas are Drāviḍas, the Mūtatuṣṭas, Vasiṣṭhas, Mudgalas and Maudgalas are said to be Gauḍas. The Gautamas, Aupamanyavas and Mudgalidrāviḍas are Autkalas; and the Kaśyapas and Parāśaras are said to be Gurjaras.' For the view that all the brahmins of Kashmir (Kashmiri Pandits) are Sārasvatas see MADAN 1989, 13; cf. BÜHLER 1877, 19. For the claim that the Kauls merely returned from Mithilā see KOUL 1991, 49.

37. For the Gotras of the Kashmirians and the fact that the Kaul stocks (Krāms) (Bamzai, Chowdhri, Daftari, Jalali Kothdar, Miskin, Muhtasib, Pahalwan, Rafiz, Sahib, Salman, Sultan, Zamindar etc.), and they alone, are of the Dattātreya Gotra, see the Census of Kashmir of 1891, para. 191 and KOUL 1991, 99.

38. MISHRA 1984.

39. "*Ānandanātha*", f. 277r4–278r1 (A), Ms. Stein Or. g. 1 of the Bodleian Library, Oxford (B) (I am very grateful to my former pupil Dr. Jürgen HANNEDER of the University of Halle for bringing the second witness to my attention): 1 *dattātreya*kulotpannaḥ* (A : *kuletpannaḥ* B) *yajurvedy asmi maithilaḥ / tatra mādhyandinī śākhā sūtraṃ kātyāyanaṃ smṛtam /* 2 *atrir gaviṣṭharākhyāś ca ṛcanānāsasaṃjñakaḥ / *dāmodaro* (em. : *dāmodhare* AB) *vaṃśadevaḥ sthitiḥ *kolāpagātaṭe* (em. : *kaulāpagātaṭe* A : *kaulāpage taṭe* B) / 3 *jātā sā yatra sītā, sarati navajalā vāgvatī yatra *pūjyā* (A : *pūjya* B) *yasyāḥ sānnidhyakartrī suranagaranadī, bhairavo yatra liṅgam / mīmāṃsānyāyavedādhyana-paṭutaraiḥ paṇḍitair maṇḍitā yā *bhūdevo* (em. : *bhodevo* AB) *yatra bhūpo janakavasumatī sāsti naḥ pūrvabhūmiḥ* 'I am a Maithila Yajurvedin of the Dattātreya clan. My branch of the [Yajurveda] is the Mādhyandina and my Sūtra is that of Kātyāyana. Born in the Gotra of Atri I have three Pravaras: Ātreya, Gāviṣṭhara and Ṛcanānāsa. My lineage god is Dāmodara [Kṛṣṇa] and my [ancestral] home is on the banks of the Kolā river. My former country is the land of Janaka ruled by a brahmin king, adorned by scholars adept in the study of Mīmāṃsā, Nyāya and the Vedas, where Sītā was born, where the venerable river Vāgvatī flows with its fresh waters, where the Suranagara river grants its presence, the site of the Bhairava Liṅga.'

The traditional birthplace of Sītā is in Tirhut, in modern Sītāmarhi (26°35 N, 85°29 E) in the administrative division of that name (formerly the Sītāmarhi subdivision of the Muzaffarpur district). Sītā

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

Once established in Kashmir, perhaps in the wake of the incorporation of the country into the Mughal empire by the emperor Akbar in 1586,[41] they adopted the local goddesses as their lineage deities, the doctrines of Kashmirian Śaiva non-dualism, and the Kashmiri

---

is believed to have sprung to life here from an earthen pot into which King Janaka had driven his ploughshare (O'MALLEY 1907, 156–158). That our anonymous author means this place and not some other possible claimant is confirmed by his mentioning the Vāgvatī and the Kolā. The former is the Bāgmatī river, which rises in Nepal near Kathmandu and descends south through northern Bihar, passing about 12 miles to the west of Sītāmarhi, or about 5 miles, if it is the old course of the river that is intended. The river Kolā (*kolāpagā*) flows south from the Bāgmatī at a point about 4 miles south of Dheng, passes about 8 miles to the west of Sītāmarhi and ends in the Bāgmatī about 16 miles SSW of Sītāmarhi and about 4 miles SW of Belsand.

From the thirteenth century onwards Mithilā was indeed famous for its great experts on Mīmāṃsā, Nyāya and Vaidika observance; and from the fourteenth it was indeed ruled by brahmins, having been made over as a fief to Kāmeśvara Ṭhakkura, the head of the Śrotriyas of Mithilā, by Tughlak Shah after his defeat of Harisiṃha, the last of the kings of the Kaṃāṭa (Simrāongarh) dynasty (*c.* 1097–1323), and the destruction of Simrāon, his capital. The Sugāon or Ṭhākur dynasty founded by this brahmin ruled over Tirhut up to the early sixteenth century, until Tirhut was conquered by Nasrat Shah of Bengal (r. 1518–32) and put under the governorship of his son-in-law Ala-ud-din, to pass shortly afterwards with the fall of the independent kingdom of Bengal into the Mughal empire.

For the three Pravaras of the Atri Gotra (its Gāviṣṭhara division) mentioned in the verses see BROUGH 1953, 34; and for the Dattātreya subdivision of this Gotra see ibid., 139.

40. Survey of India, Sheet No. 72F. Madhkaul lies between the Kolā and the Bāgmatī, about two miles W of Belsand. Dhankaul lies between the same rivers on the west bank of the old course of the Bāgmatī about two miles W of Parsauni, which lies about 5 miles N of Belsand. The two place-names are perhaps named after Kauls who received these villages as fiefs (*jagir*): Mādh (= Mādhava) Kaul and Dhan (= Dhaneśa?) Kaul. The origin of the name Kaul is not clear. It is unlikely, I believe, to be a reference to their religion: as Śāktas they are indeed Kaulas. For that is not an identity that would be so publicly advertized. Perhaps it is rather from the Kolā river, by which they had settled.

41. The Kauls' claim that they entered Kashmir from Mithilā during the reign of Zain-ul-abidin (1419, 1420–70) is supported by Munshi Muhammad-ud-din Fauq (A.D. 1877–1945), who states in his *Shabab-i-Kashmir* that a Mādho (Mādhava) Kaul, a Ganesh Kaul and a Gopāl Kaul were in charge of the land settlement and grand irrigation schemes that marked this reign (KILAM [1955], 9). Such projects were indeed put into effect by Zain-ul-abidin (PARMU 1969, 148–154). But the contemporary histories (*Rājataraṅgiṇī*) written by Jonarāja and Śrīvara, covering the periods 1149–1459 and 1459–1486 respectively, make no mention of them nor, more tellingly, of any other Kaul. Kauls are also absent both from the history of the years 1486–1537 provided by Śuka (*Rājataraṅgiṇī*) and from the anonymous supplement which takes the chronicle of the kings of Kashmir up to 1597. In fact, the earliest sure evidence known to me of Kauls in Kashmir dates from the first half of the seventeenth century. Sāhib Kaul tells us in his *Devīnāmavilāsa* (17.18) that he completed that work in Vikrama 1723 at the age of 24, which places his birth in 1636 A.D.; and the author of the *Dabistan-ul-Mazahab* refers to Kauls whom he had met in Kashmir (trans. SHEA and TROYER 1937, 229): Sudarshan Kal (= Sudarśan Kaul); Kopāl Kul (= Gopāl Kaul). From the text it appears that he was in Kashmir at dates from 1627, when he was a boy, to 1639 or 1640 A.D. Fauq reports a Paṇḍit Sada Kaul favoured by the emperors Jahangir (r. 1605–28) and Shah Jehan (r. 1628–1658) (KILAM [1955], 101). Perhaps the Kauls came in not during the reign of Zain-ul-abidin but in or after 1586, when Kashmir was annexed by Akbar, attached to the province of Kābul, and placed under the administration of imperial officers (SMITH 1917, 240), this piece of family history having been pushed back to the time during which they claimed to have returned from Bihar. Perhaps the source of Fauq's report that Kauls were engaged in land settlement and irrigation schemes has also been dated to fit this claim. As a newly acquired territory of the Mughal empire Kashmir was immediately subjected to the rigorous system of land and revenue assessment introduced under Akbar. Five imperial officials were sent for this purpose. We know their names from the *Akbarnāma* of Abu-l Fazl (PARMU 1969, 289–290), and they are not Kauls. But perhaps Kauls were brought in among their staff. They have certainly been prominent among the Kārkun sub-division of the brahmins of Kashmir, those who learned Persian and served in the administration of the Muslim rulers of the country.

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

language, all of which can be seen in the works of Sāhib Kaul, composed in Kashmir in the seventeenth century.[42] But they also maintained their East-Indian Śākta traditions, as is shown by the same author's Paddhatis. I am aware of manuscripts of three works of this kind: his *Śyāmāpaddhati* for the worship of Dakṣiṇā Kālī, his *Śrīvidyāpūjāpaddhati* for the worship of Tripurasundarī, and his *Hṛllekhāpaddhati* for the worship of Bhuvaneśvarī. They show no connection with the Śākta Śaivism long-established in Kashmir. They do not inherit its ritual forms, draw on its sources, or share its theology. They also contain elements entirely foreign to it, such as the consumption of the intoxicating drink known as *saṃvit/saṃvidā* or *vijayā* that is prepared from the powdered green *Cannabis indica* plant.[43]

42. Among these works by Sāhib Kaul (b. 1636) is a hymn to the local goddess Śārikā as the goddess of his patriline; *Śārikāstava* v. 17, f. 532r: *stotraṃ mantroddhāry adaḥ śārikāyāḥ sāhibkaulo vaṃśadevyāś cakāra* 'Sāhib Kaul is the author of this hymn to [his] lineage goddess Śārikā, a hymn which contains the [means of] the extracting of her Mantra [element by element from the initial syllable of each verse]'. He also wrote numerous works in which he expresses his devotion to the goddess in the language of Kashmirian Śaiva non-dualism, such as *Saccidānandakandalī*, *Sahajārcanaṣaṣṭikā*, *Svātmabodha*, *Citsphārasārādvaya*, *Śivaśaktivilāsa*, and *Devīnāmavilāsa*, a tour de force of devotional poetry in the most refined and complex style based on the *Bhavānīsahasranāmastotra*. In the Kashmiri language we have his *Janmacarita* (BL, MS. Stein Or. f. 3 (v); SOAS MS no. 44390, ff. 69–140).

43. *Śyāmāpaddhati* f. 16v–17v: *tatra padmāsanenopaviśya kāmeśvaraṃ saṃvidaṃ vā svīkuryāt. tad yathā* OṂ SAṂVIDE BRAHMASAṂBHŪTE BRAHMAPUTRI SADĀNAGHE BRĀHMAṆĀNĀṂ CA TṚPTYARTHAṂ PAVITRĀ BHAVA [etc.] SVĀHĀ *iti mantreṇa juhuyāt. tata ānandamayo bhūtvā raktavasanādyalaṃkṛtaḥ śivo 'ham iti bhāvayan* 'Then he should seat himself in the lotus posture and take *wine (*kāmeśvaraṃ* [?]) or *saṃvidā*. He should pour an oblation of it [into his mouth] with the following Mantra: OṂ Saṃvidā, born of Brahmā, daughter of Brahmā, become pure for the delight of brahmins [etc.] SVĀHĀ. Then when he has become full of bliss [from it], he should adorn himself with a red garment etc. and contemplating that he is Śiva ...'. See also *Hṛllekhāpaddhati*, ff. 21[119]r8–22[121]v5: *...ity anena mukhe saṃvidaṃ tattvamudrayā juhuyāt. iti saṃvidvidhiḥ. tata ānandamayo bhūtvā ...*; and the published sources *Jvālāmukhīpūjāpaddhati* p. 361,12–18 and *Bālāpūjāpaddhati* pp. 488, l. 30–489, l. 13. That the drink is prepared from cannabis is stated in *Sarvollāsa* 30.21b, in a passage extracted from the *Bhāvacūḍāmaṇi*: *bhaṅgarūpā*; and in a version of the Mantra to be recited when taking it, in which the substance is explicitly addressed by its mundane name *bhaṅgā*: OṂ BHAṄGE BHAṄGE MAHĀBHAṄGE .... It is mixed with milk, water, Mādhvīka juice, molasses and other ingredients (*Ānandapaṭala* in *Sarvollāsa* 30.47–54). It is to be drunk before the *pūjā* proper after the worship of the deities around the door to the shrine. The long Mantra for the taking of this drink is exactly as in East-Indian sources, except that where the Kashmirian Paddhatis have *brāhmaṇānāṃ* they have *bhairavāṇāṃ*; see, e.g., *Sarvollāsa* p. 117; cf. *Samayācāratantra* f. 30v (*bhairavānandatattvārthaṃ*). In other Śākta Śaiva systems, such as those inherited by the Kashmirians, the only intoxicant consumed in ritual is alcoholic liquor. In the relatively late tradition seen in East-Indian Śākta texts the cannabis-drink has been added; and the Mantra given for its empowerment (*abhimantraṇam*) is a variant of that already current for alcoholic drinks; see *Śyāmāpaddhati*, ff. 17r6–7: OṂ AMṚTE AMṚTODBHAVE AMṚTAVARṢIṆI AMṚTAM ĀKARṢAYA 2 SIDDHIṂ DEHI ...SVĀHĀ and cf. *Kulārṇavatantra* 6.55, which gives ...AMṚTE AMṚTODBHAVE AMṚTEŚVARI AMṚTAVARṢIṆI AMṚTAṂ SRĀVAYA SVĀHĀ for wine. The quantity of cannabis to be consumed is not nominal. The *Ānandapaṭala* cited in *Sarvollāsa* 30.61 requires the worshipper to use from one to three tolakas in weight, no less, no more. As can be seen from the citation above from the *Śyāmāpaddhati* of Sāhib Kaul, the worshipper could use either substance. But the East-Indian tradition is in no doubt that cannabis is superior. This is stated in a verse-line frequently encountered in its texts: *saṃvidāsavayor madhye saṃvid eva garīyasī* 'Of cannabis and wine it is cannabis that is greater'; see, e.g., *Sarvollāsa* 30.26cd and 60ab (*Mātṛkābhedatantra* and *Ānandapaṭala*) and *Samayācāratantra* f. 30r9 (*saṃvidānandayor madhye saṃvid eva garīyasī*). The Kashmirian Bhaṭṭārakasvāmin, author of the *Spandapradīpikā*, an unpublished commentary on the *Spandakārikā* of the ninth-century Kashmirian non-dualist Śaiva Kallaṭa, speaks for the old tradition against this new Śāktism, dismissing its claim that cannabis enhances spiritual awareness. In f. 3v11–13 we read: *tasmāt sarvatra vyāpteḥ spanda eva*

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

It is this Maithila tradition that is the probable source of the East-Indian elements that have intruded into some redactions of the Kashmirians' Śaiva Paddhatis. I have mentioned only the addition of East-Indian goddesses; but there are other features that support this conclusion. The Paris *Agnikāryapaddhati* includes a sub-Paddhati for an animal sacrifice to the Goddess which is a variant of those seen in Sāhib Kaul's manuals;[44] and there are visualization-texts (*dhyānam*) recited in the worship of the same redaction that are identical with those used in these Paddhatis. That for Gaṇeśa, for example, is found in the *Śyāmāpaddhati*, and it is also found in the principal Bengali Śākta treatise of the sixteenth century, the *Tantrasāra* of Kṛṣṇānanda Bhaṭṭācārya.[45]

The Newars

Syncretistic elaboration also characterizes the anonymous manuals for the worship of the royal temple deities written and followed by the Newar Śaiva priests of the Kathmandu valley. We see this in the many surviving Nepalese manuscripts of Paddhatis that give the recitation-texts in Sanskrit and the ritual instructions in Newari for ceremonies of installation (*pratiṣṭhā*) by named royal patrons, or set out the same for the *thā pūjā*, *puchā*, and *dhavaṃchā*, the periodic rituals that must be performed by these priests in the palace temples.[46] In these the principal deities are Kubjikā with her consort Navātmanātha,

---

kāraṇaṃ maheśvaro nāma. yac cātikruddho prahṛṣṭo vā kiṃ karomīti vāmṛśan / dhāvan vā yat padaṃ gacchet tatra spandaḥ pratiṣṭhitaḥ ityādinā śrīspandavyaktir atraiva darśitā tat prāmādikam. vijayāpānaratānāṃ bodhanimajjanād iyam ittham uktiḥ 'So the dynamism [of consciousness] alone is the cause, namely Śiva, because it pervades all [states]. As for the view that the manifesting of this sacred dynamism can occur only in the states mentioned in such verses as "The dynamism is present in the state one enters when one is in great anger or delight, wondering desperately what to do or running" [*Spandakārikā* 1.22], that is erroneous. This is what those who are given to drinking *vijayā* say, because [by consuming it] they diminish their awareness'. For the contrary belief, that cannabis promotes understanding, see passages such as *Sarvollāsa* 30.32–33, 55. It is probable that the use of cannabis for spiritual intoxication was adopted following the example of Muslim ascetics in India such as those of the Madāriyya order, founded by Badīʿ ad-dīn Shāh Madārī, an immigrant who settled in Jaunpur, where he died *c.* 1440 (TRIMINGHAM 1973, 97), an order notorious for its use of hashish.

44. *Agnikāryapaddhati* A, ff. 41v–44v. Cf. *Śrīvidyānityapūjāpaddhati*, ff. 122v–124r; *Śyāmāpaddhati*, ff. 37r8–38r5; *Hṛllekhāpaddhati*, ff. 70v4–74v8.

45. *Agnikāryapaddhati* A, f. 45r8; = *Śyāmāpaddhati*, f. 6v4–6; = Kṛṣṇānanda, *Tantrasāra* f. 97r2–5. The *Tantrasāra* of Kṛṣṇānanda was certainly studied in some circles in Kashmir, since several Kashmirian manuscripts of it have survived, such as BHU Mss. *c.* 1028 and *c.* 3657; Research Department, Srinagar, MSS 1479 and 1637. A number of the visualization verses of the Paris *Agnikāryapaddhati* (A) are found in the published *Uddhārakośa* associated with the *Devīrahasya*. That of Tārā (f. 80r5-v4) = 7.11–12; that of Bhuvaneśvarī (f. 80v5-81r3) = 7.14–15; that of Vajrayoginī (f. 84v3) = 7.49; that of Kulavāgīśvarī (f. 65r) = 7. 62; that of Mṛtyuñjaya (f. 47r) = 7. 71–72. The *Devīrahasya* is East-Indian in character but it has assimilated the local Kashmirian goddesses. In 2.2–6b it lists the Mantras of Śārikā, Mahārājñī, Jvālāmukhī, Śāradā and Bheḍā. The locations of the first three have been stated above. Śāradā, a goddess of transregional fame, was worshipped to the north of the valley at Shardi by the Kishenganga river (STEIN 1961, 2:279–289). Bheḍā/Bhīḍā was worshipped on a mountain in the Śukru Pargaṇa. See the *Kaśmīratīrthasaṃgraha* of Sāhib Rām, f. 21r1–2: *śukraroṣarāṣṭre parvatamastake bhīḍādevī*. Cf. STEIN 1961, 2:472–3.

46. The Newari term *thāpūjā/ṭhāpūjā* denotes a special ceremony of worship (*pūjā*) that is to be performed on one or more calendrically fixed days of every year in accordance with the requirements of an endowment for this purpose. See, e.g., G. VAJRĀCĀRYA 1976 no. 79 (a copper-plate inscription of 1799/1800 A.D. concerning a land-grant to the Taleju temple in Hanumān Ḍhokā), ll. 4–6: *prativarṣa-bhādrakṛṣṇāṣṭamyāṃ mārgakṛṣṇāṣṭamyāṃ phālguṇakṛṣṇāṣṭamyāṃ ca dānapatrasya yathālipi sāmagrībhiḥ ṭhāpūjāṃ kārayituṃ kāntipuramahānagarabhūbhāgāntargataṣaṭtriṃśottarapaṃcāśat* 536

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

Siddhilakṣmī,[47] Guhyakālī, and Tripurasundarī. Each of these four is an independent pan-Indian Śaiva deity with her own ritual system;[48] and for each there survive Paddhatis for personal worship. But here their cults are combined to form a larger structure. This in turn subsumes certain other deities of special significance to the palace, such as the Durgās Tumbeśvarī, Ugracaṇḍā and Māneśvarī, and, in certain contexts, the aniconic goddess Duyinimāju/Dumāju. It is also the basis of Paddhatis for the worship of yet other deities.[49]

I propose that this came about in response to the accumulation of the goddesses of successive dynasties, that when a new dynasty came to power the palace priests integrated its goddess with those already in worship in the royal temples, creating a composite Paddhati for this purpose.

The evidence for this falls far short of enabling a chronology but it does support the hypothesis of the historical process. The worship of the four goddesses is divided in the Paddhatis into two segments called the *paścimadegulipūjā* and the *uttaradegulipūjā*. The meaning of these Newari terms is 'worship of the western tutelary deities' and 'worship of the northern tutelary deities'. Now Kubjikā is worshipped in the first and Siddhilakṣmī, Guhyakālī and Tripurasundarī in the second. The sense of the reference to the cardinal points is that in the classification of Śākta systems that was current among the Newars and elsewhere in the subcontinent Kubjikā is the goddess of the Western Transmission (*paścimāmnāyaḥ*, *paścimānvayaḥ*), while Siddhilakṣmī and Guhyakālī are the goddesses of the Northern Transmission (*uttarāmnāyaḥ*, *uttarānvayaḥ*). When the worship of Tripurasundarī is classified within this schema it is generally in late texts of its own tradition that seek to present it as the culmination of all the others and so classify it as the Transmission of the Zenith (*ūrdhvāmnāyaḥ*), though an earlier tradition seen in the *Ciñciṇīmatasārasamuccaya*, a secondary, syncretistic scripture of the Western Transmission, had classified the cult of the Nityās, a system that prefigures the classical, as that of the Southern Transmission.[50] Here it is tagged on, as it were, without a separate

---

mūriparimitakṣetraṃ sakuśodakaṃ saṃkalpya samarpitam asti 'Land within the capital Kāntipura [= Kathmandu] measuring 536 Mūris has been given with the formula of intent and with kuśa grass and water to enable a *ṭhāpūjā* to be performed with all necessary materials, as specified in the document that records the donation, every year on the 8th days of the dark fortnights of the months Bhādrapada, Māgha and Phālguṇa'; and no. 80, concerning the same temple, recording a land-grant to fund two annual *ṭhāpūjā*, on the 8th of the bright fortnight of Bhādrapada and the 5th of the same of Āśvina. This provides textual confirmation of the account of this kind of *pūjā* given by VERGATI (1995, 115–116) on the basis of anthropological enquiry in Bhaktapur as periodic acts of *pūjā* established by the Malla kings with donations of land to pay for them.

The *puchā* (Skt. *pavitrārohaṇam*) is the annual expiatory offering of threads to the deities, and the *dhavaṃchā* (Skt. *damanārohaṇam*) is the annual expiatory offering of the parts of the fragrant-leafed Artemisia Indica plant (*damanaḥ*, *damanakaḥ*), though it appears from our lexicographers of Classical and Modern Newari that the plant offered by the Newars is camomile; see TAMOT 2000, s.v. *dhavaṃchā*, *dhavanasvāna* and MANANDHAR 1986, s.v. *dhavaḥ*, *dhavaḥsvāā*.

47. Siddhilakṣmī is identical in Mantra and iconography with the Siddhalakṣmī of the Kashmirian tradition.

48. See SANDERSON 1988: 682–690 (1990 repr.: 150–158).

49. See, e.g., *Talejusake thāpūjā yāya vidhiḥ*; *Tulajādīpadānapūjāvidhi* (*Talejusake matāpūjāvidhi*); *Uttarāmnāyapavitrārohaṇavidhi*; *Pratyaṅgirāpaddhati*; *Tumbeśvarīpūjāpaddhati*; *Navarātrapūjā*; *Tulajāthāpūjāvidhi* (in text: *śrī 2 jayabhūpatīndramalladevanatayā thāpūjā*); *Tulajācūlikāsthāpanavidhi*; *Revantamahābhairavapūjāvidhi*. The last three of these are the texts of installation ceremonies in which the client/sponsor (*yajamānaḥ*) is King Jayabhūpatīndramalla (r. 1696–1722) of the kingdom of Bhaktapur.

50. *Ciñciṇīmatasārasamuccaya*, ff. 17v9–20r8. The goddess here is called Kāmeśvarī and Tripurā and she has a retinue consisting of eleven [Nityā] goddesses (Hṛllekhā, Kledinī, Nandā, Kṣobhiṇī, Madanāturā, Nirañjanā, Rāgavatī, Madanāvatī, Khakalā, Drāviṇī and Vegavatī) and Kāmadeva. The same

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

identity, as an annex of the 'worship of the northern tutelary deity' (*uttaradegulipūjā*), so as not to disrupt the balance of the established structure of the complementary co-existence of the western and northern traditions.[51]

The proposal that these western and northern goddesses are worshipped side by side because those of one dynasty have been added to those of another is encouraged by remarks in the *Parātantra*, a short scripture of 582 verses which gives every appearance of being a product of the Kathmandu valley. There are many manuscripts of it in that region and no evidence that it was known outside it. Furthermore, the system of goddess worship that it teaches is seen only in the Paddhatis of the Newars.

It is primarily concerned with the deities of the Northern Transmission, their Mantras and worship, but it embeds this matter in a treatment of a larger artificial schema of six Transmissions, those of the four cardinal points, the zenith and the nadir. The deities assigned to the east and south are Pūrṇeśvarī and Niśeśvarī, goddesses that have no place in the Śaiva tradition outside this context, appearing to my knowledge only here and in the Newars' Paddhatis.[52] It may well be that they were created artificially to fill these two positions in the schema and it is perhaps an indication of this that their cults are said by the *Parātantra* to be current in the concentric continents (*dvīpaḥ*) beyond the oceans that surround the known world, Pūrṇeśvarī in Plakṣadvīpa and Kuśadvīpa, and Niśeśvarī in Śākadvīpa and Puṣkaradvīpa.[53] No such imagined geography is invoked in the treatments of the other goddesses of the transmissions, who are all deities of mainstream traditions that were well-established in Nepal and beyond.

To the zenith (*ūrdhvāmnāyaḥ*) is assigned Tripurasundarī, and to the nadir (*adhaāmnāyaḥ*) the Buddhist Tantric goddess Vajrayoginī, a deity that was of major importance in the Śaiva-Buddhist culture of the Kathmandu valley, as the antiquity and popularity of her temple at Sankhu attest.[54] The text is explicit about her Buddhist identity and this is what justifies her position at the nadir. She is included because she was a major goddess

---

system of deities is that of the scripture *Nityākaula*; see f. 2r7–2v1. The *Ciñciṇīmatasārasamuccaya* refers to the systems assigned to the cardinal points as *āmnāyaḥ*, as in other sources; but it also calls them houses (*gharam*) and *gharāmnāyaḥ*. Thus, f. 15r7: *punar anyaṃ pravakṣyāmi ...caturṇām ghara-m-āmnāyām avatāraṃ pṛthak pṛthak* 'I shall teach you another matter ...the descent among men of the four Gharāmnāyas, each separately.' *ghara-m-āmnāyāṃ* is for correct Sanskrit *gharāmnāyānāṃ*.

51. *Talejusake thāpūjā yāya vidhiḥ*, f. 4v3: *tato uttara siddhilakṣmīguhyakālītripurasundarīpūjanaṃ*.

52. *Parātantra* 1.55ab: *pūrṇeśvarī mahogrā sā *pūrvāmnāyā* (Cod. [f. 5r5–6] : *pūrvāmnāya* Ed.) *prakīrtitā*; 2.1a, 1d, 2d: *dakṣiṇāmnāya vakṣyāmi ...*niśeśī* (corr. : *niṣyeśī* Cod. and Ed.) *ca *nirargalā* (conj. : *niraṅgalā* Cod. and Ed.) *...niśeśī raktacarcikā*. In the Paddhatis see, e.g., *Tulajādīpadānapūjāvidhi* f. 185r: *ekā mūrtir anekadhā trijagatī pūrṇeśvarī vāsave / bhūteśī gaganopamā bhagavatī niśeśvarī dakṣiṇe*.

53. *Parātantra* 1.71cd (on Pūrṇeśvasrī): *plakṣadvīpe kuśadvīpe bahudhā ca tadanvagāḥ* 'She has many followers in Plakṣadvīpa and Kuśadvīpa'; 2.25bc (on Niśeśvarī): *sarvasādhakasiddhidā / śākapuṣkaradvīpeṣu* 'bestowing Siddhi on all her Sādhakas in Śakadvīpa and Puṣkaradvīpa'. I take the reading *tadanvagāḥ* to be meant as equivalent to *tadanugāḥ*, a barbarism that could easily be removed by emending to *tadanvayāḥ*. However, cf. 1.61ab: *iṣṭatvena ca saṃpūjyā sarve tasyānugāḥ smṛtāḥ*.

54. On her cult in Nepal and its role in linking exoteric deities both Buddhist (Prajñāpāramitā) and Śaiva (Durgā) with the deities of esoteric Buddhism see ZANEN 1986 and GELLNER 1992, 256. The local *Nepālamāhātmya* gives the Śaiva angle on the ambiguity of Vajrayoginī by making her a form of Pārvatī, having Pārvatī favour the Buddha by appearing to him in that form (1.59): *tapasyāṃ kurvatas tasya buddhasya girijā tadā / tuṣṭā babhūva prakaṭā nāmnā sā vajrayoginī* 'When the Buddha was engaged in asceticism Pārvatī was delighted and appeared to him under the name Vajrayoginī'. The *Parātantra* calls her Śābarī Prajñāpāramitā (6.1b: **śābarī* [em. : *sāvarī* Cod. f. 15v6 : *sāvali* Ed.] *jinamātṛkā*), which may mean 'the Prajñāpāramitā of [the Siddha] Śabara[pāda]', since Śabara was associated with the Sādhana of this goddess; see ENGLISH 2002, 8, 360, 367–368.

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

among the Newars both Buddhist and Śaiva, but in the point of view of the latter her Buddhist background means that she can be acknowledged only in an inferior position, as able to bestow quick rewards in this life but not liberation.[55] The deities assigned to the west are Kubjikā and Navātmanātha and to the north Siddhilakṣmī and Guhyakālī, the first under her name Pratyaṅgirā.[56] This is exactly as in the Paddhatis' arrangement of the complementary tutelaries, and while the assigning of Kubjikā and her consort to the west is not distinctively Newar, that of the combination of Siddhilakṣmī and Guhyakālī is. Moreover, the iconography of the deities of both transmissions given in the *Parātantra* agrees with that seen both in the Newars' Paddhatis and in their religious art.[57]

The *Parātantra*, then, is almost certainly a product of the Newar community of the Kathmandu valley. It is therefore of great significance to the analysis of the Newars' bicentric Paddhatis that it associates the Western and Northern Transmissions that constitute those two centres with distinct royal lineages and that it does so in their case alone. It tells us that Kubjikā is the lineage goddess (*kuladevī*) of the kings that are descended from the Moon (Somavaṃśin) and that Siddhilakṣmī (Pratyaṅgirā) is the tutelary goddess (*iṣṭadevī*) of those who are descended from the Sun (Sūryavaṃśin).[58]

55. *Parātantra* 6.1d–2a: *kalau śīghraphalapradā / bauddhamārge* 'bestowing quick results in the Buddhist religion during the Kaliyuga'; 6.6c–7b: *saugatānugamā sākṣāt kalau śīghraphalapradā / ihaiva phaladā nityaṃ* (corr. : *nityā* Ed.) *nāpavargaphalapradā* 'Followed by the devotees of the Buddha, quickly bestowing manifest results in the Kaliyuga, always bestowing results in this life but not granting the reward of liberation'.

56. In the sequence of Paṭalas 1 to 6, in which one Paṭala is devoted to each of the six goddesses of the transmissions, the goddess of the northern, the subject of Paṭala 4, is Guhyakālī. But in the long seventh Paṭala, in which this transmission is singled out for further treatment, this identity expands to the pair Siddhilakṣmī (Pratyaṅgirā) and Guhyakālī.

57. One of the rooms in the Art Museum in Bhaktapur contains scroll paintings on cloth (Skt. *paṭaḥ* [→ Tib. *thaṅ ka*], Newari *paubāhāā*) of all these deities. On the left wall is a painting of a form of the white dancing Navātmanātha embracing the red Kubjikā and another which shows the three goddesses of the *uttaradegulipūjā* in a row: the red four-armed, one-faced Tripurasundarī seated in the lotus-posture on a prostrate Sadāśiva, the black nine-faced, fifty-four-armed Guhyakālī dancing on a prostrate Bhairava, and the ten-armed, five-faced white Siddhilakṣmī seated on Rudra. On the far wall as one enters is a large and very finely executed painting of the white Siddhilakṣmī in her cosmic form (*viśvarūpā*), with eighteen fully depicted arms in the foreground and countless others in circuits behind and thirteen faces in the lowest of eight diminishing tiers. I claim no skill in such matters, but in style all three paintings appear to me to belong to a time before the eighteenth century. Elsewhere in the museum is a painting of Guhyakālī with the goddess Siddhilakṣmī in the upper left corner and Tripurasundarī in the upper right. None of these images is correctly identified in the legends attached to their frames, a fact that underlines the esoteric nature of such knowledge: the educated public of Bhaktapur is generally unable to identify such deities.

58. *Parātantra* 3.23d–25b: *kubjikā cakranāyikā / aṅgiraḥsādhitā vidyā dakṣāya pratipāditā / nahuṣāya tato *dattā* (corr. : *dattvā* Ed. and Cod.) *tataś candrānvayāya ca / pārthivānāṃ ca saumyānāṃ kuladevīti kīrtitā* '...Kubjikā, Leader of the Wheel. [Her] Mantra, which had been mastered by Aṅgiras, was taught [by him] to Dakṣa. It was then given to Nahuṣa and thence to the [kings of the] lineage of the moon. It is declared to be the family goddess of the lunar kings'; 7.58c–61b (Cod. f. 22v5–23r1): **pratyaṅgirā* (Cod. : *tyaṅgirā* Ed.) *mahākālī mokṣasaubhāgyadāyinī* / 59 *nānayā sadṛśī vidyā vidyate bhuvanodare / rājyadā dhanadā mokṣadātrī kaivalyadāyinī* / 60 **tenāstreṇa* (Cod. : *tenāstave* Ed.) *ca rāmeṇa rāvaṇo vinipātitaḥ / tadāprabhṛti sā devī *sūryavaṃśanṛpeśvaraiḥ* (em. : *sūryavaṃśā nṛpeśvarāḥ* Cod.) 61 *iṣṭatvena ca saṃpūjyā *sarve* (corr. : *sarvva* Cod.) **tasyānugāḥ smṛtāḥ* (conj. : *tasyānugāśritā*) 'The Great Kālī Pratyaṅgirā bestows the bliss of liberation. There is no Vidyā in the worlds equal to this. She bestows sovereignty, wealth, liberation and transcendence. It was with this as his weapon that Rāma slew Rāvaṇa. From that time forward she has been worshipped by the kings of the solar dynasty[, who

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

Two dynasties claiming descent from the Sun ruled in the Kathmandu valley. The first is that of the Licchavis, known to us from dated inscriptions from A.D. 456/7 (Mānadeva) to 733 (Jayadeva). The second is that of the Mallas, who ruled from 1200 until they were conquered in the second half of the seventeenth century by Pṛthivīnārāyaṇ Śāh, the first king of the non-Newar dynasty that has occupied the throne of Nepal down to the present.[59] The solar kings in the mind of the redactor of the *Parātantra* were no doubt these Mallas, since the text contains several indications that it is unlikely to have been written before the fifteenth century.[60] That Siddhilakṣmī was their tutelary goddess is supported by other evidence. King Jitāmitramalla (r. 1673–1696) of Bhaktapur composed an esoteric hymn to her, the *Siddhilakṣmīmantrayantroddhārādistotra*,[61] in which he presents the goddess in terms that accord well with this hypothesis. When he explains how to form her Mantra for the purpose of repeated recitation (*japaḥ*) he identifies the reciter as the king,[62] a restriction I have seen in no other Paddhati. He also intends his hymn to be used by his descendants. For he tells us that by reciting it kings will achieve success (Siddhi), bringing about contentment among their ministers and destroying the lineages of

---

are Rāma's descendants,] as their personal goddess. It is tradition that all of them are her devotees'. The last two lines (60c–61b), containing her association with the solar kings, are lacking in the edition.

59. The Licchavis' claim to be kings of the lineage of the sun is made in Jayadeva's Paśupati inscription of Saṃvat 157 (A.D. 733), vv. 3–14 (Dh. VAJRACĀRYA 1973, 548–550): 3 *sūryād brahmapautrān manur atha bhagavāñ janma lebhe tato bhūd ikṣvākuś cakravartī nṛpatir api tataḥ śrīvikukṣir babhūva* ...5cd *śrīmattuṅgarathas tato daśarathaḥ putraiś ca pautrais samaṃ rājño ṣṭāv aparān vihāya parataḥ śrīmān abhūl licchaviḥ* ...7cd *sārdhaṃ bhūpatibhis tribhiḥ kṣitibhṛtāṃ tyaktvāntare viṅśatiṃ khyātaḥ śrījayadevanāmanṛpatiḥ prādurbabhūvāparaḥ* .... It is made for the Mallas in the epithets that precede their names in all their inscriptions and in many manuscript colophons that mention a Malla as the reigning king.

60. It names the East-Indian Mahāvidyā goddesses Dakṣiṇakālī, Ugratārā, Chinnamastā, Bagalāmukhī and Nīlasarasvatī in its coverage of the Southern Transmission (1.18d–20a). It also speaks of the cult of Tripurasundarī as having two forms, one following the counter-brahmanical practice (*vāmācāraḥ*) and the other the brahmanical (*dakṣiṇācāraḥ*), and identifies the latter as that of the Sannyāsins (*bhikṣūṇām*) (5.43ab: *vāmadakṣiṇayāgena sundarī dvividhā matā* and 5.44cd: *dakṣiṇācārayāgena bhikṣūṇāṃ paramā smṛtā*). This expurgated form of the worship of Tripurasundarī is the hallmark of the tradition of the Sannyāsin Śaṅkarācāryas. The earliest evidence that the Sannyāsins of that tradition were receiving patronage in the Kathmandu valley is in the reign of Ratnamalla (*c.* 1484–1530); see MICHAELS 1994, 116 ff. See also the copper-plate inscription of 1635/6 from the Jagannātha temple in the Hanumān Ḍhokā palace square in Kathmandu (G. VAJRĀCĀRYA 1976, no. 10), which names a number of Daśanāmasannyāsins of this order.

61. Comprising 42 verses in the Vasantatilaka and Sragdharā metres it gives the visualization, the Mantra (the *navākṣarī vidyā*: OṂ HRĪṂ HŪṂ HĀṂ PHREṂ KṢOṂ KROṂ NAMAḤ), the design of the Yantra, and the deities and their positions within it. It may have been transmitted independently. The colophon (f. 44r6–7): *iti śrīmanmahārājādhirājataraṇikulakīrtigaṅgābhagīrathāyamānanṛpativṛndavanditacaraṇakamalaśrīśrīsumatijayajitāmitramalladevaviracitaṃ śrīsiddhilakṣmīmantrayantroddhārādistotraṃ samāptam* '[This] Hymn in which inter alia the Mantra and Yantra of Siddhilakṣmī have been brought forth, which has been composed by Mahārājādhirāja Śrī 2 Sumatijayajitāmitramalladeva, who is a Bhagīratha to the Ganges that is the fame of the Solar Dynasty, whose lotus-feet have been venerated by a multitude of kings, has come to its end'.

62. F. 43r1: *mantrasya mūrdhni ruciraṃ praṇavaṃ nidhāya cainaṃ japen nṛpavaro namasā hi yuktam / lakṣmīḥ sthirā bhavati tasya gṛheṣu nityaṃ vāgdevatā vasati tadvadanāravinde* 'Having placed a glowing OṂ at the head of the Mantra the foremost among kings should repeatedly recite it with NAMAḤ [at its end]. Prosperity will endure in his palaces and the goddess of [eloquent and learned] speech will be constantly present in the lotus of his mouth'.

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

their enemies.[63] It was probably intended to be incorporated into the Paddhati of Siddhilakṣmī's worship, and it is indeed in this context that it has been transmitted.

Confirmation of her role as the personal deity of the Malla kings appears in the Paddhati for Navarātrapūjā in the autumnal royal festival of Dasain. For there Siddhilakṣmī is identified unambiguously as Rājamantrabhaṭṭārikā-Siddhilakṣmī 'Siddhilakṣmī, the Goddess of the King's Mantra'.[64]

The importance of this goddess to the kings of Nepal is underlined by evidence of her having been linked with Paśupatinātha, the premier Śiva of Nepal, venerated far beyond its borders and acknowledged as their patron by the kings of the realm from the time of Aṃśuvarman in the sixth century down to the present.[65] For she is or has become the esoteric identity of Vatsalādevī, a goddess on the bank of the Bāgmatī river below the entrance to the temple of Paśupatinātha. The benedictory verse of a stele inscription of 1412/3 in the courtyard of that temple describes her as his consort,[66] and this relationship is also enacted in her annual festival.[67] The Nepalese chronicles (*Vaṃśāvalī*) of the post-Malla period record a tradition that the eighth-century Licchavi king Śivadeva acknowledged this goddess as the principal deity of the realm, establishing an annual human sacrifice and a public car-procession in her honour, adding that when five generations later the king attempted to suppress these sacrifices he was prevented from doing so by divine intervention.[68]

That Siddhilakṣmī is or became the liturgical identity of this goddess is certain. Her processional image has not been observed in detail, but it has been seen to conform to the

63. F. 44r2: *ādau guruṃ kalaya rāvam amuṃ nṛpānāṃ siddhipradaṃ vividhamantrisukhākaraṃ ca*; f. 44r4–5: *stotraṃ caitan nṛpānāṃ ripukulaśamanaṃ*.

64. The context is the rites of the eighth day (Mahāṣṭamī). After setting up and worshipping first the royal sword (*khaḍgasthāpanam*) and then two vessels for the *kalaśapūjā* of Amṛteśabhairava and the *kumbhapūjā* of Vāruṇī, the priest is to do the worship of the *paścimadeguli* followed by that of the *uttaradeguli*. The Paddhati for the latter begins (*Navarātrapūjā*, f. 5r6): *śrī 3 rājamantra-bhaṭṭārikāśrīsiddhilakṣmīdevārcanaṃ kārayet. siddhilakṣmīdeguli yāya* 'He should [now] perform the worship of Siddhilakṣmī, the most sacred Goddess of the King's Mantra. He should do [the rite of] the tutelary Siddhilakṣmī'; it ends (f. 5v5): *thvate siddhilakṣmīdeguli samāpta* 'This [rite of] the tutelary Siddhilakṣmī has been completed'. It is followed by those of Guhyakālī (with the Mantras taught in the *Parātantra*) and Tripurasundarī, with the addition of a *pūjā* to the goddess Kaumārī, associated with the worship of nine female children (*kumārī*) and two young boys that will take place the next morning (Mahānavamī). For a detailed account of the worship of these children (as personifications of Ugracaṇḍā, her eight subordinate goddesses, Gaṇeśa and Bhairava) performed by the king, or rather the brahmin priest who nowadays must take his place, the other priests of the Taleju temple, and the descendants of the Malla kings see LEVY 1990, 540 ff. This addition of the *pūjā* of the goddess Kaumārī is an example of how while personal Śaiva worship is relatively free of syncretistic pressures, the liturgies of such royal priests must be adaptable in order to accomplish their engagement with the civic religion and its calendrical variety.

65. As soon as Aṃśuvarman began to publish edicts in his own name, after doing so in the name of his father-in-law Śivadeva, he assumed the epithet *bhagavatpaśupatibhaṭṭārakapādānugṛhītaḥ* or *bhagavatpaśupatibhaṭṭārakapādānudhyātaḥ* 'favoured by the feet of the Revered Lord Paśupati'. The earliest of these edicts (Dh. VAJRĀCĀRYA 1973, no. 71) is dated in Saṃvat 29 of his era (= A.D. 595).

66. Inscription of Jyotirmalla, v. 1 (TANDAN 1999, 122): *śrīśrīnepālakhaṇḍe sakalamalahare *vyāpinaṃ* (conj. : *vyāpitaṃ* Ed.) *puṇyabhūmau *śambhuṃ* (em. : *śambhu* Ed.) *śrīvatsaleśaṃ parama-paśupatiṃ pañcavaktraṃ *surūpam* (conj. : *svarūpam* Ed.) ...*naumi* 'I praise the beautiful five-faced Śambhu, supreme Paśupati, the lord of holy Vatsalā, who pervades the sacred land of Nepal that removes all impurity ...'.

67. MICHAELS 1984.

68. LÉVI 1905–8, 2:124–125; WRIGHT 1877, 126.

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

iconography of Siddhilakṣmī in being five-faced and ten-armed. This identification has been confirmed by the priests of her temple[69] and is placed beyond reasonable doubt by a visualization-text given for her worship in the Newari Paddhati literature.[70] That she should have two names, one esoteric and the other exoteric, is in no way surprising for a goddess such as this whose cult extends into the domain of the civic religion. The same is the case in Patan (Lalitapaṭṭana), which has the temple of a Siddhilakṣmī known as Pūrṇacaṇḍī[71] who is worshipped there as their tutelary deity by a section of the Limbus and Rais calling themselves Kirantis, the name which the chronicles gave to the earliest rulers of the Kathmandu valley.[72]

The kings of the lunar dynasty said by the *Parātantra* to have had Kubjikā as their lineage goddess (*kuladevī*) cannot be identified. But they were no doubt understood by the composer or redactor of this scripture to be the immediate predecessors of the Mallas ruling during the tenth to twelfth centuries, an earlier date being less likely in the light of what we know of the time during which the cult of Kubjikā was constituted and disseminated. Epigraphical evidence for Nepal during those centuries is extremely sparse and the accounts of the late local chronicles are unreliable. But although those sources are of limited value as sober history they at least reveal a model of dynastic alternation that is relevant to the present issue. For in their account a dynasty of five lunar kings was followed by the solar Licchavis; those were followed by a series of lunar kings that they call the Ṭhākurīs; and these gave way in their turn to the solar Mallas.[73] Nepalese manuscripts of texts pertaining to the worship of Kubjikā, unlike those pertaining to the cults of Siddhilakṣmī or Guhyakālī, do survive from the period before the Mallas. We have a *Laghvikāmnāya* manuscript of 1037/8 and at least four manuscripts of the *Kubjikāmata* extending from some time during the reign of the Pāla king Rāmapāla (*c.* 1072–1126) to 1179.[74]

69. MICHAELS 1984, 112–114 and 1994, 98.

70. *Gajaśāntimahābalividhi*, f. 58r: *sūryakoṭinibhā devī *rudrārūḍhā* (corr. : *rudrārūḍhāṃ* Cod.) **vaśaṃkarī* (conj. : *kaśaṃkarau*) / *daśa*hastā maheśānī pañcavaktrā* (corr. : *hasta maheśāni pañcavaktra* Cod.) *kirīṭinī* / *khaḍgatriśūlavarada vajrakādyakhaṭvāṅgapa* / *abhay†ākalada + ṣāṃ† *trinetreyaṃ virājate* (conj. : *trinetrayaṃtirācatā* Cod.). This passage is too corrupt to yield all ten of the hand-attributes. But the sword, trident, two gestures, vajra, skull-cup, and Khaṭvāṅga are all held or shown by Siddhilakṣmī. If the crux in the penultimate Pāda conceals a vase (*kalaśa-*) or goad (*aṅkuśa*), both are among her hand-attributes.

71. An inscription of 1636 A.D. refers to the goddess under both names: *māī jagadambā siddhilakṣmī pūrṇacaṇḍī* (GAIL 1988, 2:48). Another, in the wall of the temple, begins with a Sanskrit hymn to Siddhilakṣmī (**Siddhilakṣmīstava*) and refers to the temple as that of the donors' tutelary goddess (*sveṣṭadevī*) Pūrṇacaṇḍī (ll. 13–14: *śrīmatsveṣṭasureśvarīti viditā yā pūrṇacaṇḍī parā* / *...tatprāsādasya parā tu kṛtā jīrṇṇoddhṛtir mudā*).

72. VERGATI 1995, 154.

73. See LÉVI 1905, 2:83; REGMI 1965–66, 1:106.

74. These manuscripts are described in GOUDRIAAN and SCHOTERMAN 1988, 4–5, 6–7, 9–10 and 14. The dates given here for Rāmapāla's reign are those cogently argued by D.C. SIRCAR (1976). For the alternatives that have been proposed, from 1057 for its commencement to 1132 for its end, see HUNTINGTON 1984, 29–37, where these are conveniently tabulated.

Who, then, is the mysterious goddess Taleju who has repeatedly been identified in the ethnographic literature and in the inscriptions as the tutelary deity (*sveṣṭadevatā*) of the Malla kings—see, e.g., G. VAJRĀCĀRYA 1976, no. 28 recording a *tulādānam* by Cakravartīndramalla in 1664 A.D. 'for the pleasure of his *iṣṭadevatā*, the Mother Taleju': *śrīśrīśrīsveṣṭadevatā-tarejumāju-prītina*—and whose image, Mantra, and other esoteric aspects were concealed, we are told (e.g. LEVY 1990, 239–240), from all but the royal priests, the king and his male relatives? The Paddhatis for the worship of Taleju, in which one would expect to find a simple answer to this question, are puzzling at first sight, because they

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

Bali

Nor was eclectic syncretism limited to the Paddhatis of the subcontinent. It is also apparent in those of the Śaiva brahmin priests (*pědanda śiwa*) of Bali and Lombok, inheritors of the traditions of pre-Islamic East Java. The Śaivism of those texts is a form of the Saiddhāntika division of the Śaiva Mantramārga,[75] but it contains elements of other traditions. Thus in the *Ādityahṛdayastava* the deity, Śiva as the Sun (*śivādityaḥ*), is equated with Tumburu, the presiding deity of the Vāmasrotas of the Śaiva Mantramārga, accompanied "by Jayā and the others", that is to say, by his four sisters Jayā, Vijayā, Jayantī/Ajitā and Aparājitā.[76] Similarly, Khaḍgarāvaṇa appears in the Balinese Śaiva

---

do not mention her outside their titles, consisting of the worship of the sequence of the deities of the *paścimadegulipūjā* and the *uttaradegulipūjā*. I propose, therefore, that there is no Taleju over and above these deities and that she is either Kubjikā or Siddhilakṣmī, or both. If she is one of them to the exclusion of the other then Kubjikā is the most likely candidate. She and Navātmanātha stand at the head of the liturgies. Moreover, there is a shrine of Wanelāykū Taleju in the Tachapāl ward of Bhaktapur (SLUSSER 1982, 320a) which is surely the Paścimamūlasthānabhaṭṭārikā ('the western goddess of the primary/original site') of Vanerājakule mentioned among the deities of this ward in the liturgy of the *Pratyaṅgirāpaddhati*, f. 29r–v: *gaṇeśa tavacapāla. mantra pūrvavat. baliṃ. vanerājakule. mantra.* AIṂ 5 HSKṢMLVRYŪṂ SHKṢMLVRYŪṂ ŚRĪPAŚCIMAMŪLASTHĀNABHAṬṬĀRIKĀ*YAI (corr. : *ya* Cod.) *pādukāṃ. 3. baliṃ. bhīma tavacapāl* ..... For Newari *lāykū* (←Skt. *rājakulam*) means 'royal palace'; there is no other goddess included for worship in that ward; and the names Paścimamūlasthānabhaṭṭāraka and Paścimamūlasthānabhaṭṭārikā are those under which Navātmanātha and Kubjikā/Samayā are addressed in the Mantras of the *paścimadeguli*; see, e.g, *Pratyaṅgirāpaddhati*, f. 13r. The term *mūlasthānam* in these Mantras is used elsewhere in Śaiva texts to mean the site of the primary or original installation of the deity of a temple. This fits the theory that Kubjikā is the earliest of the two principal royal goddesses and/or the main deity of the Taleju temples. For the latter sense one may compare such terms as *mūlācārya* for the chief priest of the temple.

On the other hand we have seen that Siddhilakṣmī is known as the Goddess of the King's Mantra and this strongly suggests that the name Taleju was also applied to her, because the secret Tantric knowledge of the king is identified as that of Taleju in the narrative literature. Furthermore, the *Parātantra* speaks of the 290-syllable Vidyā of Pratyaṅgirā (Siddhilakṣmī) as having come down through a line of transmission in an account (7.48–59) that strongly resembles the legend of the transmission of Taleju's Yantra written by a brahmin of Bhaktapur who works as a public storyteller summarized by LEVY (1990: 234–241). As with the Yantra of Taleju, the Pratyaṅgirā is acquired by Rāvaṇa, the demon king of Laṅkā (7.50). Later it is given to Rāma on the banks of the Sarayū river so that he can use it to defeat Rāvaṇa (7.53c–54 reading *daśonā triśatākṣarī* with the manuscript in 54d) but the Mantra so far revealed is defective, having 300 syllables in its perfect state. In the modern storyteller's narrative Rāma acquires Taleju's Yantra by defeating Rāvaṇa and takes it to Ayodhyā. The goddess instructs him in a dream to throw it into the river Sarayū, which flows past Ayodhyā, because its worship would be defective after his death. Here the narratives part company, the Newari legend introducing the solar king Nānyadeva, who is said to have rescued it from the river, and his descendant Harisiṃhadeva who is said to have brought it to Bhaktapur, whose Taleju temple is believed to be the first in the valley. But this 'history' from the time of Nānyadeva and Harisiṃhadeva, both Maithila kings known from inscriptions, could not have been included in the *Parātantra*, because its presence would have contradicted its claim to scriptural status by showing that its composer postdated figures of relatively recent times. Further, the same text distinguishes, as we have seen, between Kubjikā as a lineage goddess (*kuladevī*) and Siddhilakṣmī as a tutelary or chosen goddess (*iṣṭadevī*); and Taleju is referred to in the inscriptions as the *iṣṭadevī* of the Malla kings. It is probable, then, that the name Taleju was applied to both goddesses and either, according to context. But further research into the Paddhatis may shed clearer light on this issue.

75. Old Javanese *siddhānta*, *śaiwasiddhānta*, *śiwapakṣa*, *śaiwapakṣa*, *śiwaśāsana*. See ZOETMULDER 1982, s.v.

76. HOOYKAAS 1966, 118: KṢAṄ KṢIṄ KṢEṄ KṢUṄ *jayādibhir anugatatanuṃ tumburutryakṣarāṅgam*. This would make better sense if we read *tumburuṃ tryakṣarāṅgam*: 'Tumburu, embodied in the tri-

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

ritual for the preparation of consecrated water.[77] This is a Rudra of the Śaiva Bhūtatantras of the exorcistic Paścimasrotas division of the Mantramārga.[78]

We also find an element of the more ancient Śaivism of the Pāśupata Atimārga in the *pañcakuśika* or *pañca ṛṣi*, the five sages Kuśika/Mahākuśika, Gārga/Garga, Metṛi/Maitri, Kuruṣya, and Pātañjala/Pṛtañjala/Pratañjala, who were venerated by the ascetics of the Javanese Ṛṣi sect, distinguished in Old Javanese sources from both the Śaivas and the Buddhists. These are put into correspondence with the constituents of the human body in a Balinese priest's detailed comment on the Śaiva Paddhati presented by Hooykaas.[79] That they are the hallmark of the Ṛṣi denomination is clear from the Old Javanese *Kuñjarakarṇa*, since that teaches that the *pañcakuśika* are to the Ṛṣi sect what the five Tathāgatas are to the Mahāyāna Buddhists and the five deities to the Śaivas[80] setting out the correspondences between sets of five in the three denominations (*tripakṣa*) as follows: (1) Mahākuśika/Kusika = Akṣobhya = Rudra; (2) Gārga/Garga = Ratnasambhava = Brahmā; (3) Maitri/Metri = Amitābha = Maheśvara; (4) Kuruṣya = Amoghasiddhi = Viṣṇu; and (5) Pātañjala/Pratañjala = Vairocana = Śiva.[81]

The first four are known from Indian sources as the disciples of Śiva in his Lakulīśa incarnation, and are remembered as the originators of the four teaching lineages (Gotras)

---

syllable, his form accompanied by Jayā and the others [in the syllables] KṢAṄ KṢIṄ KṢEṄ and KṢUṄ'. In Javanese usage the "trisyllable" (*tryakṣaram*) is the syllable OṂ (*praṇavaḥ*), seen as comprising A, U and MA; see in the Sanskrit and Old Javanese *Jñānasiddhānta* 26.11cd: *a-u-ma tryakṣaraṃ saṃkhyaṃ tryakṣaraṃ praṇavaṃ smṛtam*; also 8.9b: *oṃkāraṃ tryakṣaraṃ tyajet*; 16.6ab; 18.8cd; 26.10d. See also ibid., p. 74 in the chapter *saṅ hyaṅ praṇavajñāna kamokṣan* 'Liberation through the knowledge of the holy Praṇava': *nāma saṅ hyaṅ oṃkāra praṇava viśva ghoṣa ekākṣara tumburu tryakṣarāṅga* 'The names of the holy sound OṂ are Praṇava, Viśva, Ghoṣa, the Monosyllable, Tumburu embodied as the Trisyllable'. Not understanding the reference to these deities HOOYKAAS (1966, 119) took KṢAṄ KṢIṄ KṢEṄ KṢUṄ *jayādibhir anugatatanuṃ* to mean "[whose body is followed by [the syllables] kṣaṃ kṣiṃ kṣeṃ kṣuṃ and [the exclamation] Victory and so forth", missing the reference to the goddesses, and *tumburutryakṣarāṅgam* to mean "whose body consists of the three syllables tum-bu-ru". For these deities, whose worship was also current among the Khmers, since it was the basis of the state-cult of the *Kaṃrateṅ Jagat ta Rāja/Rājya* (Devarāja) founded *c.* 800, see, e.g., *Vīṇāśikha* 94–118; *Devyāmata*, f. 40r1–2: **tumburuḥ* (corr.: *.um.uru* Cod.) *sa sadāśivaḥ / divyavastraparīdhāno nānābharaṇabhūṣitaḥ / jayā ca vijayā caiva jayantī cāparājitā / dūtibhiḥ kiṃkaraiḥ sārddhaṃ saṃvṛtas* **tumburuḥ* (corr.: *tumburuṃ* Cod.) *sthitaḥ / *divyarūpāḥ* (corr.: *divyarūpā* Cod.) *sulāvaṇyā bhuktimuktiphalapradāḥ / saumyarūpo* **mahādevaḥ* (em.: *mahāde* Cod.) *krīḍate sa jayādibhiḥ*; f. 40r3–3: **jayāḍyāḥ* (corr.: *jayādyā* Cod.) *kiṃkarā dūtyās tuṃburuś ca mahādyutiḥ / vāmasrotākhyataś caiva vāmavaktrād* **vinihsṛtāḥ* (corr.: *vinisṛtā* Cod.); *Netratantra*, Paṭala 11. For the evidence of this cult in Java see GOUDRIAAN 1973.

77. See HOOYKAAS 1974, 54.

78. His Mantra and rites (*mantravidhānam*) are taught in the *Khaḍgarāvaṇakalpa* of the scripture *Kriyākālaguṇottara*, ff. 42v4–47v1. In the non-scriptural literature of the Paddhatis of Kerala we find Khaḍgarāvaṇa and his Mantra in the 13th chapter (*grahadhvaṃsapaṭalaḥ*) of the *Tantrasārasaṃgraha*, alias *Viṣanārāyaṇīya*, of Nārāyaṇa of Śivapuram (15th century) and in the *Īśānaśivagurudevapaddhati* (the *Siddhāntasāra* of Īśānaśivagurudeva), *Mantrapāda*, *Pūrvārddha*, *Paṭala* 41.

79. HOOYKAAS 1966, 135 (pañca-ṛṣi: Kusika, Garga, Metri, Kuruṣya, Pṛtañjala).

80. *Kuñjarakarṇa* 23, 1/2 (cited in SOEBADIO 1971, 55, n. 182): *sogata pañcabuddha ṛṣi pañca kuśika wiku śaiwa pañcaka* 'the five Tathāgatas of the Buddhists, the *pañcakuśika* of the Ṛṣis, and the pentad of the Śaivas'; *Kuñjarakarṇa* 23, 1/3–4/3. Cf. *Tantu Panggēlaran* 76.3 cited in ZOETMULDER 1982 s.v. *pañcakuśika* (Kuśika, Garga, Metri, Kuruṣya, Pratañjala); *Nawaruci* 64.5 cited ibid. (*pañcarṣi:* Kusika, Garga, Metri, Kurusya, Prētañjala).

81. *Kuñjarakarṇa* cited in SOEBADIO 1971, 55–56, notes 182 and 186.

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

of the Pāñcārthika Pāśupatas[82] and commonly seated around him in sculptural representations.[83] The fifth in the Javanese pentad might be thought to be Patañjali, the founder of the Yoga system, though Pātañjala, if that is the original form, would rather denote a follower or descendant of that sage. But it seems hardly convincing as a name, which is what we require in this context; and we can have little faith in it when we see that the variant Pṛtañjala or Pratañjala is widely attested.[84] It is more probable that Pātañjala is an attempt to substitute sense for a corrupt reading Pṛtañjala than that the latter is a corruption of the former. Perhaps what is concealed here is an ancient corruption of a name of Agastya. For the sage Agastya was widely worshipped in Java[85] and he is famous in brahmanical mythology for having drunk all the waters of the ocean. Possibly, then, the original name was *Pītañjala 'He who drank the waters'.[86]

It might be urged against this hypothesis that the correspondences in the *Kuñjarakarṇa* show that this figure, whoever he was, was seen by the author of that text as the highest of the five, since he is equated there with Vairocana, the highest of the five Tathāgatas, and with Śiva, the highest of the five deities of the Śaivas, and that therefore we should expect rather a name for Lakulīśa himself, since no-one else could reasonably be seen as their senior. But there is the alternative that the poet's correspondences are superficial and that Agastya or some other sage concealed behind the transmitted name has merely been added at the end of the established Pāśupata list to enhance his status in a Pāśupata environment. That this is so is strongly suggested by the position of the name and by the fact that the four that precede it are ordered with the seniormost in first position, since Kuśika was venerated by the Pāśupatas as the first of Lakulīśa's disciples.[87]

But whatever the origin of the fifth name the tradition is old. For the five sages are found in this form among the powers invoked as divine witnesses in the imprecation formulas of Old Javanese charters from 860 onwards.[88] They also appear in the cosmogony of the *pūrwabhūmi* prayer in the Śaiva liturgy of the priests of the Tengger in

82. In the original *Skandapurāṇa*, ed. Bhaṭṭarāī, 167.127–143 these four are Kauśika, Gārgya, Mitra and Kauruṣya. In *Liṅgapurāṇa* 1.131 they are Kuśika, Garga, Mitra and Kauruṣya. In the Cintra Praśasti of A.D. 1287 from Somnāthpattan/Prabhāsa (*EI* 1:32, v. 16–17b) they are Kuśika, Gārgya, Maitreya and Kauruṣa.

83. For illustrations of Lakulīśa surrounded by his four disciples see, e.g., MEISTER 1984, plates 83–84, 88–92, 108–110, 117, 124–125, 127, 129–130.

84. See, here, notes 79–80 and 89; also the text of the Balinese *pemangku* temple-priest's prayer in STUART-FOX 2002, 170: *kurusya maka-pulacek, pratanjala maka-padma, sang hyang kaki maka-puspa.*

85. DE CASPARIS and MABBETT 1992, 312–313, following POERBATJARAKA 1926.

86. This tentative hypothesis supposes an irregular compound without reduction of the first member to its stem form (an *aluk samāsaḥ*) (= *pītaṃ jalam yena sa *pītañjalaḥ*). For the myth of his drinking up the waters see, e.g., verses in the Kumbhakoṇam edition after *Mahābhārata* 12.202.11: *agastyo 'sau mahātejāḥ pātu taj jalam añjasā / tatheti coktvā te devā munim ūcur mudānvitāḥ / trāyasva lokān viprarṣe jalam etat kṣayaṃ naya / tatheti coktvā bhagavān kālānalasamadyutiḥ / dhyāyañ jalādanivahaṃ sa kṣaṇena papau jalam* ' "Let that radiant [sage] Agastya quickly drink that water". Having agreed those gods were delighted and said to the sage: "Save the people, O brahmin sage; get rid of this water". The Venerable [Agastya], who was as radiant as the fire of the aeon, agreed, and meditating on the mass of the water-devouring [*Vāḍava fire?] drank the water in an instant.' This hypothesis would be less tentative if this epithet were found in place of the name Agastya in some Sanskrit source. I do not know of an instance. However, we do see the nearly synonymous Pītābdhi 'He who drank the ocean'.

87. *Pañcārthabhāṣya* pp. 3–4.

88. ZOETMULDER 1982, s.v. *pañcakuśika*; see, e.g., the Poh Dulur copperplate inscription of A.D. 890 (BARRETT JONES 1984, 197–198), side B, l. 4: *kusika gargga metrī-[illegible]nurusya* (*sic* Ed.) *patañjala*. They are also mentioned as witnesses in the Old Javanese *Rāmāyaṇa* of the eleventh century (24.155).

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

East Java. There it is said that there first arose the goddess Umā (Umo Betari, = Skt. Umābhaṭṭārikā) and then these five 'gods' (*dewoto*, Skt. *devatā*).[89]

Now in this prayer the officiant is identified as a *resi pujangga*, which if we may judge by the use of this Old Javanese term (*ṛṣi bhujangga*) in Balinese religion, denotes members of a class of non-brahmin, commoner priests with lower status and function than the brahmin priests of Śiva (*pĕdanda śiwa*) but serving 93 per cent of the population. In Bali the *ṛṣi bhujangga* are members of the title-group *sengguhu*, which the brahmins rank as elevated Śūdra.[90] The element *rĕsi/ṛṣi* and the special position assigned to the five sages in this *pūrwabhūmi* text, which has its close parallel in the liturgies of the Balinese *rĕsi bujangga*,[91] suggests that these priests too have their origin in the Ṛṣi sect. Its establishments appear from Old Javanese sources to have been located in isolated areas, of which the Tengger highlands above the court centres of Singhasari and Kaḍiri, are an outstanding example; and it appears that their beliefs and practice became closely entwined with popular religion,[92] as is the case with the *rĕsi bujangga* of the Tengger and Balinese.

Considering the centrality of the founders of the Pāñcārthika Pāśupata lineages in their cosmogony text and the role of these sages in the imprecations of Old Javanese charters from the earliest period onwards, I offer the hypothesis that these non-brahmin priests inherit what remains of the earliest Śaivism in Java, that this derives from the Atimārgic (Pāśupata) phase of the religion, that the Mantramārgic Siddhānta was introduced into Java at a later date, as it was, as we shall see, in Kambujadeśa, and that once this new tradition had been adopted by the courts and their brahmin officiants, the older system subsisted in a subordinate position among non-brahmin officiants, who survived in two roles. In the first, perhaps restricted to the courts and the core areas around them, they would have co-operated with brahmin priests as assistants and in that context been restricted to such functions as the invocation of lesser powers, as is the case among the Balinese *rĕsi bujangga* in the *nyepi*, the annual day of silence, in which the brahmin *pĕdanda śiwa* make offerings to the high gods while at their side the *rĕsi bujangga* make offerings to the demons, so protecting the island from their assaults during the coming year.[93] In the second they served in their own right as the priests of the majority of the population, as in Bali, or in remote rural areas such as the Tengger highlands as the only priests, where their survival reveals that though Śaivism may have flourished among the social elites in and around the court centres it had also established itself among the rural population, where it survived, as we can see in the *pūrwabhūmi* liturgy with a core element of an older Pāśupata or Pāśupata-influenced tradition, one that was influential enough in Java to survive also in the exegesis of the high-status liturgy of the *pĕdanda śiwa*, albeit in an abstract schema in which it no longer has the exalted position originally assigned to it.[94]

89. HEFNER 1985, 178, text and tr.: *sira muah mijil kang ponco dewoto / kongsi gargo mentri kuruso / kang kalilan wong pritonjolo* 'Together they emerged the five gods / Kongsi, Gargo, Mentri, Kuruso, / along with the Pritonjolo person(s)'. The *pañcakuśika* are called gods, as here, in the Old Javanese *Pārthayajña* (40.10) (ZOETMULDER 1982, s.v. *pañcakuśika*).

90. HOOYKAAS 1974, 243; HOBART et al. 2001, 80–81 and 233, n. 30.

91. HEFNER 1985, 271–272.

92. SANTIKO 1995, 65.

93. HOOYKAAS 1974, 53; HEFNER 1985, 271.

94. ZOETMULDER reports that in Old Javanese (1982, s.v.) the Sanskrit term *bhujaṅga* is used for a brahmin or other person of clerical rank and notes that in the older texts "it often appears to be a younger brahman (student or disciple)". Perhaps, then, it refers in the case of the term *ṛṣi bhujangga* to the subordinate status of these priests. For the distinction between Atimārgic and Mantramārgic forms of Śaivism see SANDERSON 1988.

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

Thus while the liturgy of the Balinese is predominantly Saiddhāntika Śaiva it shows elements of the non-Saiddhāntika Mantramārgic traditions of the Vāmasrotas and Paścimasrotas and also of the archaic Atimārga. But the religious culture of the Javanese court of Majapahit, whose traditions the Balinese have inherited, was a Śaiva-Buddhist coalition; and so we find that Buddhism too has been drawn into the redaction of the liturgy. For the last two of the eight goddesses of the eight fingers in the preliminary ritual of the cleansing of the hands (*karaśuddhi*) are Prajñādevī and Parimitādevī.[95] These are surely created out of the Buddhists' goddess Prajñāpārimitā as Prajñāpāramitā is known in later Old Javanese sources.[96] The other six are personifications of the four unlimited virtues or Brahmavihāras of Buddhism (*upekṣā*, *karuṇā*, *muditā*, *maitrī*) but with Śāntā taking the place of the fourth, together with the two brahmanical goddesses Lakṣmī and Sarasvatī.

We see, then, that Śaiva priests paid scant attention to the rule that a Paddhati must adhere closely to a single scriptural source. Pure Paddhatis of this kind were believed to exist for the personal worship of initiates, but when we look closely even they show admixture from disparate ritual systems. In the case of worship conducted by professional priests—and it is this class of ritualist that figures in the Khmer inscriptions—we find that the needs and expectations of their clients have lead to thoroughly syncretistic developments in three independent cultural contexts. It would be unreasonable, therefore, to assume that Kambujadeśa was exceptional in this regard.

Indigenous Religion

A further limitation is imposed by the character of our evidence. Unlike Christianity and Islam, which would claim half the population of Southeast Asia during the age of commercial expansion in the fifteenth to seventeenth centuries, the religions of India that flourished in the region before this period demanded no radical rejection of existing cults. As the new religions were assimilated by the Khmers they were no doubt added to traditions of the kind we see today in the propitiation and mediation of the local Khmer spirits known as the *neak ta*, accommodating them through subordination in a manner similar to that seen with the *nat* and *phi* cults of Theravādin Burma and Thailand.[97] But the sources at our disposal do not allow us to see this substrate, reflecting as they do only the Indic high culture patronized by the ruling elite.

There are a few deities mentioned that may be pre-Indic. We have, for example, deities identified only by the pre-Angkorean title Kpoñ Kamratāṅ Añ 'My Venerable Lord/Lady' and no name;[98] and there are a few more that are identified only by association, such as *vraḥ kaṃmratāṅ añ tnal* 'the god of the road' (K. 910), *vraḥ kaṃmratāṅ añ kaṃmratāṅ teṃ kroṃ* (K. 137, K. 600) 'the god of the Kroṃ tree',[99] *vraḥ kaṃmratāṅ añ kaṃmratāṅ ai travaṅ ver* 'the god of the double pond' (K. 22), and *vraḥ kaṃmratāṅ ai travaṅ ver* 'the kamratāñ tṅaiy luc 'the god of the west' (K. 22), and *vraḥ kaṃmratāṅ añ bha nāriyya* (K. 107), has a non-Sanskrit name, and yet another, *kpoñ kaṃmratāṅ añ śrī Senāmukhavijayā* (K. 904 of

95. See HOOYKAAS 1966, 50.

96. See, e.g., *Deśawarṇana* 67.2, 69.1, 74.1 and ZOETMULDER 1982, s.v. *prajñāpāramitā*.

97. On the *neak ta* see MABBETT and CHANDLER 1996, 107–124.

98. K. 600 of 612 A.D. from Angkor Borei; K. 790 (undated, seventh century); K. 910 of 651; Ka. 10 (*NIC* II–III, 186) (late pre-Angkorean).

99. CŒDÈS (K. 600, *JC* 2:23, n. 8) rejects the possibility that pre-Angkorean Khmer *kroṃ* = mod. Khmer *kroṃ* 'below', on the gounds that the latter was *karoṃ* in Angkorean Khmer. He therefore proposes that it is is probably the name of a kind of tree.

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

713), has a name that is Sanskrit but unparallelled, so that one might suspect this of being the Sanskritization of an originally Khmer designation.

Such names have been thought to be firm evidence of pre-Indic cults.[100] But there are reasons to be cautious, over and above the obvious consideration that the argument rests on negative evidence, namely that certain deities are not identified in a way that enables us to say that they are certainly Indic. For another nameless Kpoñ Kaṃmratāṅ Añ appears in the Khmer portion of K. 79 of 644; but in the Sanskrit portion she is identified as 'the goddess Caturbhujā (the four-armed)', which is very probably a reference to an Indic image. The probability that this is a Khmer deity is further diminished by the context in which she is mentioned. The inscription, which records its installation, states that it was commissioned by a Śaiva ascetic (*yamī*), that is to say by one of those least likely to be involved in the cult of a pre-Indic deity. Furthermore we are told that he was motivated to undertake this meritorious action by his devotion to Śiva and that the procedures adopted were those appropriate to the Goddess. All this suggests that the image was that of Śiva's consort.[101]

Caution is also prompted by the case of the *kaṃmrateṅ jagat piṅ thmo* 'the god of the stone pond' of K. 653 of 956, who is surely identical with the deity who appears synonymously in Sanskrit as Aśmasaronātha and Śilāsaronātha in K. 56, an undated inscription of the reign of Rājendravarman (944–*c.* 968). This and the cases cited above have been considered "perfect examples of Sanskrit names devised as translations of Khmer cult terminology';[102] but the evidence is far from compelling. While recording the many pious acts of a Vaiṣṇava dignitary related to the chief queen of Rājendravarman, the inscription tells us that he reinstalled the Viṣṇu in the temple of the Lord of the Stone Pond (Aśmasaronātha):

yaḥ kulapāvanīḥ
catasraś śrīpater arccā janmabhūmāv atiṣṭhipat
vaiṣṇavīṃ pratimām aśmasaronāthasya sadmani
bhūyo bhūrivibhāṃ bhīmapure kātyāyanītanum
K. 56 B, v. 17b–18

...who installed four images of Viṣṇu in the place of his birth to purify his family, reinstalled the image of Viṣṇu in the temple of the Lord of the Stone Pond brightly shining, and installed an image of Durgā in Bhīmapura, ...

If the Lord of the Stone Pond were a pre-Indic deity this would mean that a Viṣṇu was present as a subsidiary in his temple, a striking result, since the character of the inscriptions and the material evidence would lead us to expect that if a pre-Indic deity persisted it would have been an ancillary rather than the principal deity of a temple. But I see nothing that compels this interpretation against the alternative that the Lord of the Stone Pond was actually a Viṣṇu and that it was his own image that was being reinstalled. The use of names in -nātha for Viṣṇus is seen elsewhere in the corpus;[103] and later in the

100. VICKERY 1998, 140–149.

101. K. 79, v. 2a ...2d–3: *mukhartuvānai gaṇite śākāpde ...pratiṣṭhitaṃ devicaturbhujākhyaṃ / bhaktyā bhagavataś *śambhor* (corr.: *śambhur* Ep.) *pitāmātror vvimuktaye / devīyathārtthacaritais sthāpitaṃ yaminā bhuvi* 'In Śaka 565 ...an image has been installed called Goddess Caturbhujā. An ascetic has installed it in the world to the ceremonies appropriate to [the installation of] the Devī, out of his devotion to Lord Śiva [and] for the salvation of his parents.'

102. VICKERY 1998, 142. He gives the Old Khmer form of the name as *kaṃsteṅ jagat piṅ thmo*. This is how it appears in K. 56.

103. K. 35 of the reign of Jayavarman IV (928–*c.* 940), K. 99 of A.D. 922/3, and K. 270 of A.D. 921.

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

same inscription we learn that this Vaiṣṇava dignitary built a brick temple for a Devāriñjayaviṣṇu to the north of the temple of the Viṣṇu of the Stone Pond (Śilāsaroviṣṇu):

> *yo kārṣīd iṣṭakāharmmyan devāriñjayaśārṅgiṇaḥ*
> *dhāmnaś śilāsaroviṣṇor uttarāśākṛtasthiteḥ*
> K. 56 D, v. 33

> Who built a temple of bricks for the Devāriñjayaviṣṇu installed to the north of the temple of Śilāsaroviṣṇu, ...

It is highly probable, then, that the Lord of the Stone Pond and the Viṣṇu of the Stone Pond are one and the same. To defend the hypothesis that the Lord is a distinct, pre-Indic deity we have to accept three entities in place of one with metrically variant names: a pre-Indic Lord of the Stone Pond with his own temple, a Viṣṇu within that temple, and a separate temple of a Viṣṇu of the Stone Pond; and we would have to be constrained to do so by firmer evidence than the claim that the Khmer version of the name in K. 653 looks like pre-Indic cult terminology. The fact is that we have no clear evidence of such terminology but only the probability that when the Khmers started to give Indic deities Khmer titles they would have drawn on pre-Indic conventions.

Even if the inscriptions do refer to non-Indic deities, they tell us nothing about them other than their names. Nor is it certain that this lack of information prevents us from seeing the religious life of the rural masses alone, those on whose observances it is likely that the imported Indian religions had the least impact. For we cannot be sure that the old practices did not continue even among the Indianized elite, since absence of evidence is not evidence of absence. Conversely we cannot know how far the Indic religions had penetrated beyond the culture of the court, though the evidence of Java and that of the very large numbers of Khmers involved in various capacities in the support of these traditions strongly suggest that they must have put down roots in the minds and practices of the wider population.

It is even more unlikely that the reticence of our sources concerning the pre-Indic traditions merely deprives us of knowledge of those traditions themselves. It is almost certain that it also diminishes and distorts our understanding of the imported religions. For if our sources allowed us to see Khmer religion and society in the round we would no doubt recognize that Indian forms clothed Khmer beliefs and practices or embedded them as subsidiaries, as we see wherever Indian religions have been assimilated, both in India itself and beyond it from Burma to Bali, and from Tibet to Japan. [104]

It is in any case implausible that even purely Indian rituals would not have taken on a Khmer character when performed by Khmers for Khmers, just as their images of Indian deities have a distinctive style and aesthetic quality while remaining within the parameters of an imported iconography.

104. VICKERY argues (1998, 142) that the popularity of Durgā Mahiṣāsuramardinī in 7th-century Khmer art should not be seen simply as a borrowing of a cult popular in southern India but "must be explained, if possible, in terms of a local socio-religious setting." Rightly insisting that comparative Southeast-Asian ethnography may be more important than Indian prototypes, he adds in a footnote that buffalo sacrifices presided over by female shamans are still known in northern Thailand, citing a report in the *Bangkok Post* of 2 July, 1986, thereby suggesting that the cult of Durgā Slayer of the Buffalo Titan (Mahiṣāsuramardinī) was an Indic veneer over an indigenous tradition. Perhaps it was. But he cites no evidence that the Khmers sacrificed buffaloes to Durgā, and, more crucially, no evidence that they did so in a manner that was Khmer rather than Indian.

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

Khmer Subsidiary Brahmanism

Also present among the Khmers was the Brahmanism of Śruti and Smṛti. Brahmin dignitaries who officiated for the Khmer monarchs are commended for their knowledge of the Vedas, their ancillaries (*vedāṅgāḥ*), the Upaniṣads, the Epics and the Purāṇas;[105] and Rājendravarman (r. 944–*c.* 968) is credited with repeatedly causing the gods to drink Soma, which is a claim that he had Soma sacrifices performed. If this is not empty praise, it entails the existence of a community of orthodox brahmins versed in the Vedas and Śrauta ritual, since no Soma sacrifice can be performed with less than sixteen such persons as officiants (*ṛtvik*).[106] This king is also said to have studied the exegesis (*mīmāṃsā*) of the Vedas from a brahmin Someśvarabhaṭṭa and then to have taught it to

105. K. 5 (5th century), v. 9: brahmin officiants learned in the Vedas, Vedāṅgas and Upavedas (Āyurveda etc.); K. 180 of A.D. 948: king Rājendravarman's ācārya Rudrācārya, pupil of Śivasoma, the Guru of king Indravarman, describes himself as learned in the Vedas (*hotrā vedavidā*); K. 263 C, v. 22: Jayavarman V is said to have been praised by brahmins who knew the essence of the Upaniṣads, adhered to the path of Smṛti, and were learned in the Vedas and their ancillaries (*viprair ...vvedāntajñānasārais smṛtipathaniratair ...abhinuto vedavedāṅgavidbhiḥ*); K. 300, v. 22 (14th century; concerning Siddharṣi, Guru of the Rājaguru Vidyeśa): *cakāra deśan nāmnemaṃ madhyadeśañ jan(ākulam) / *vedavedāṅgavid vipras* (em. : *vedavedāṅgav(i)dv(i)pra(ṃ)* BERGAIGNE) *s(tr)iya(ṃ) prāpya pr(i)yān t(u) saḥ* 'That brahmin, learned in the Vedas and their ancillaries married his dear wife and then founded this populous place called Madhyadeśa'; K. 725 (Jayavarman I), v. 5: *atrāsīd vrāhmaṇo vidvān vedavedā[ṅga]pāragaḥ dharmmasvāmīti v[i]khyātas* 'Here there was a learned brahmin called Dharmasvāmin, who had mastered the Vedas and their ancillaries'; K. 809, between A.D. 878 and 888, v. 40ab (re Rudra, teacher of Śivasoma): *vedavid* 'learned in the Vedas'; K. 692, v. 47 (A.D. 1189/90 or 1195/6) concerning Bhūpendrapaṇḍita I (Mūrdhaśiva): *siddhāntatarkkamunisammataśavdaśāstravedārthapañcajaladhīn pivati sma* '[who] had drunk the five oceans that are the Śaiva scriptures, Nyāya, the grammar approved by the [three] sages [Pāṇini, Kātyāyana and Patañjali], the Vedas and Artha[śāstra]; K. 809, v. 42, concerning Śivasoma, honoured by Indravarman: *purāṇabhāratāśeṣaśaivavyākaraṇādiṣu śāstreṣu kuśalo yo bhūt tatkāraka iva svayam* 'who was as adept in the Purāṇas, the *Mahābhārata*, the Śaiva scriptures, grammar and other śāstras as if he had composed them himself'; K. 1002 (JACQUES 1968), v. 53, concerning Nīlakaṇṭha, father of Śaṅkarapaṇḍita (priest of Harṣavarman III): *śaive vyākaraṇe kāvye purāṇe bhārate 'khile / adhīty adhyāpayām āsa yo gurūṇām anugrahāt* 'who studied the Śaiva scriptures, grammar, Kāvya, Purāṇa and the *Mahābhārata*, and, through the favour bestowed by his teachers, taught them'; K. 359 (pre-Angkorean), v. 3–4: a brahmin donated copies of the *Mahābhārata*, the *Rāmāyaṇa* and a Purāṇa to the temple of Tribhuvaneśvara that he had founded, and made a provision that they should be recited continuously every day (v. 4: *rāmāyanapurāṇābhyām aśeṣaṃ bhāratan dadat / akṛtānvaham acchedyāṃ sa ca tadvācanāsthitim*); Sūryavarman I's attachment to the stories of the Purāṇas and the two epics (K. 218, v. 11: *purāṇarāmāyanabhāratādikathā-*; K. 661, v. 56b: *bhāratādikathārataḥ*); K. 661, v. 94: *sārāṇi bhāratādīnāṃ *śrutvoktāni* (conj. : *śrotoktāni* Cœdès) *mudaṃ yayau* (concerning Jayendrapaṇḍita). The *Mahābhārata* is cited (*vyāsagītam*) in K. 279 C1, v. 2. The verse quoted is 12.65.28 of the Pune critical edition.

106. K. 958, v. 6 (A.D. 947/8): *yo *dhanāmvunidhir* (conj. : *dhanāmvunidhiṃ* conj. CŒDÈS : *dhānāmvunidhiṃ* Ep.) *viprān divya ⏑⏑yaśomṛtam / surān somaṃ samaṃ yajñe asakṛt kṛty apīpyata* '*wise and an ocean of riches (?), who in his sacrifices repeatedly caused both the brahmins [whom he engaged as officiants] to drink the nectar of celestial ...fame and the gods to drink Soma'. K. 692, v 55 (A.D. 1189/90 or 1195/6) says that Bhūpendrapaṇḍita gave his deceased parents all the merit he had accumulated from life to life through such actions as repeated recitation of Mantras, Homa, and the Soma sacrifice (*dideśa ...japahomasomayāgādikarmmaphalam ācaritañ ca pitroḥ*). But this does not mean necessarily that he was claiming to have performed Soma sacrifices in his current existence. For the sixteen officiants necessary for a Soma sacrifice (Agniṣṭoma) see, e.g., *Āpastambaśrautasūtra* 10.1.19.

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

others;[107] and Yaśovarman I (r. 889–910) and Jayavarman II (r. 802–*c.* 835), the inaugurator of the unified kingdom of Angkor, are both praised for their commitment to those sacred texts.[108] Persons are commended for their knowledge of and adherence to the Dharmaśāstra and kings for promoting this adherence.[109] We hear of its presence in the curriculum of royal education,[110] of certain dignitaries who were official reciters or readers of the Dharmaśāstra (*svat vraḥ dharmmaśāstra*),[111] of judicial decisions being reached following its authority,[112] and of king Rājendravarman's being versed in its legal system.[113]

In the domain of ritual, we hear of the brahmanical rites of passage (*saṃskārāḥ*) being performed by one royal brahmin for another,[114] and of the principal ceremonies that Indian brahmanical authorities required to be performed for the monarch by his personal

107. K. 806, v. 239: *śrīsomeśvarabhaṭṭād yo mīmāṃsāṃ śrutavān dvijāt / vudhān vyākhyātavedārthāṃ vrahmaṇyān adhyajīgamat* 'Having studied from the brahmin Someśvarabhaṭṭa the Mīmāṃsā in which the meaning of the Vedas has been explained he taught it to pious scholars'.

108. K. 323, v. 34ab: *homayogādinirato vedasaktaḥ* 'devoted to Homa, Yoga and the rest, attached to the Vedas' (Yaśovarman I); K. 534 (reign of Yaśovarman I), v. 22: *[veda]priyaṃ mahībhṛtam* 'the king, devoted to the Vedas' (Jayavarman II).

109. K. 53, v. 6: *tasya tau mantriṇāv āstāṃ sanmatau kṛtavedinau / dharmmaśāstrārthaśāstrajñau dharmmārthāv iva rūpinau*; 'Those two ministers of that [king Bhavavarman], valued by the virtuous and appreciative of his favour, were so expert in the Dharmaśāstra and the Arthaśāstra respectively that it was as if they were themselves the very embodiments of Dharma and Artha'; K. 263 C v. 22: *viprair ...smṛtipathaniratair* 'by brahmins ...who delighted in the path of Smṛti'; K. 111, v. 13: *vyavahāre satāṃ mārgge manvādīnāṃ mate same / kāladhvāntaniruddhe yo *madhyāhnārkka* (corr. : *madyāhnārkka* CŒDÈS) *ivābhavat* 'In law he [Jayavarman V] illuminated the unequalled path of the virtuous taught by Manu and the other [sages], a path that had been obscured by the darkness of time, as the midday sun [/illuminates an uneven road obscured by the darkness of night]'; K. 208, v. 11: *manumārggānugāminaḥ* 'following the path of Manu'; K. 235, v. 20cd: *apālayiṣyat ...mānavān mānavanītisāraiḥ* ' he would have protected men with the essences of the Way of Manu'; K. 528, v. 174ab, concerning Rājendravarman: *śubhaṃyunā yūnā manuvartmānuvarttinā* 'a handsome youth following the path of Manu'; K. 834, v. 51, concerning Sūryavarman I: *kāṇṭārāgāśrayo bhūtibhūṣito viṣayārijit / manumārggāśrito gādi yo mahāyatir ity api* 'Although he was the object (*-āśrayo*) of his lover's (*kāntā-*) desire (*-rāga-*), adorned (*-bhūṣito*) with wealth (*bhūti-*), a conqueror (*-jit*) of the enemies (*-ari-*) of the realm (*viṣaya-*), and a follower (*-āśrito*) of the path of Manu (*manumārga-*), he was also (*api*) called (*agādi*) a Great Ascetic (*mahāyatir*) [/(since) adopting (*-āśrito*) the [Śaiva] Mantramārga (*manumārga-*) he had resorted to (*-āśrayo*) the wilderness (*kāntāra-*) and mountains (*-aga-*), adorned (*-bhūṣito*) with ashes (*bhūti-*), and had conquered (*-jit*) the enemies (*-ari-*) that are the objects of the senses (*viṣaya-*)].'

110. K. 235, D. ll. 65–66: *vraḥ pāda kamrateṅ añ ryyān vidyā phoṅ daṃnepra siddhānta vyākaraṇa dharmmaśāstra śāstra phoṅ tadai ti* 'Our Revered Lord [king Udayādityavarman II] studied the sciences [with his Guru Jayendrapaṇḍita]: the Śaiva scriptures, grammar, Dharmaśāstra, and other Śāstras'.

111. K. 374 of 1042 A.D.; K. 814 of 979/80–1004/5 A.D., 5, ll. 52–54: *mratāñ śrī pṛthivīndropakalpa svat vraḥ dharmmaśāstra mratāñ śrī rājopakalpa svat vraḥ dharmmaśāstra.*

112. K. 569 of A.D. 1306 (ed. POU 2001, 166–171), ll. 14–17 and ll. 24–26. In the latter, the closing words of the inscription, the ruling king Śrīndravarman and his chief queen Śrīndrabhūpeśvaracūḍā are described as 'protecting their subjects and the pious endowments of others in accordance with the sacred Dharmaśāstra': *prajāpālana parapuṇyānupālana nu vraḥ dharmmaśāstra.*

113. K. 806, v. 143 refers to Rājendravarman as expert in the eighteen topics of legal business (*vyavahāraḥ*) (*aṣṭādaśapadajñena*). For these eighteen, which begin with non-payment of debts see *Manusmṛti* 8.3–7 (7cd: *padāny aṣṭādaśaitāni vyavahārasthitāv iha*); *Nāradasmṛti* 1.16–19 (19d: *ity aṣṭādaśapadaḥ smṛtaḥ*). CŒDÈS misunderstood *aṣṭādaśapadajñena* here to mean 'qui connaissait le vers de dix-huit pieds'.

114. K. 1002 (JACQUES 1968), v. 52: *garbhādhānādividhinā saṃskṛtaḥ kṛtyavedinā / bhagavadvyāsapādena guruṇā tena yaḥ kṛtī* 'that learned man who was purified by that dutiful Guru Bhagavadvyāsapāda with the rites beginning with conception'.

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

officiants. We are told of the consecration of the king that inaugurates his reign (*rājyābhiṣekaḥ*),[115] the consecration of the chief queen (*mahiṣī*, *agradevī*),[116] and that of the crown prince (*yuvarājaḥ*),[117] and of the *puṣyābhiṣekaḥ*, by which a king is to be reconsecrated to his office annually by the royal chaplain and the royal astrologer. In a clear allusion to this brahmanical ceremony Rājendravarman is described as being "consecrated every Puṣya by a stream of nectar poured from one hundred golden vases".[118] Our Indian sources reveal that the stream of nectar to which the inscription refers was melted butter. The king is to be covered with a blanket and then this butter is to be poured over him from eight, twenty-eight or one hundred and eight vases. The blanket (*ghṛtakambalam*) is then removed and he is bathed with the waters of the 'Puṣya bath' (*puṣyasnānāmbubhiḥ*).[119]

Then there are the recurrent royal fire-sacrifices of one hundred thousand oblations (Lakṣahoma) and ten million oblations (Koṭihoma):[120]

115. K. 14, v. 5 (= K. 310, v. 6); K. 136 B, v. 28; K. 194, Khmer, A l. 14 (*rājābhiṣeka*); K. 254, v. 9; K. 273, v. 29; K. 377, v. 1; K. 661, v. 16; K. 806, v. 18 and 136; K. 989 A, v. 14. For this brahmanical ceremony see *Raghuvaṃśa* 17.8–20; *Viṣṇudharmottara*, Khaṇḍa 2, chapters 21–23 (→ *Agnipurāṇa*, chapters 218–219).

116. K. 485, v. 95c (the consecration of Indradevī as the chief queen of Jayavarman VII after the death of her younger sister Jayarājadevī): *tatpūrvajā nṛpatinā vihitābhiṣekā*. The consecration of the chief queen is required by *Viṣṇudharmottara* 2.7.7c–8b, to be received by her either together with the king at the time of his initial consecration, performed by the royal chaplain and astrologer or, if later, by the king himself, as in the case of Indradevī: *evaṃguṇagaṇopetā narendreṇa sahānagha / abhiṣecyā bhaved rājye rājyasthena nṛpeṇa vā*.

117. K. 569 (*NIC* II–III, 166–171) of 1306 from Banteay Srei (Īśvarapura) records that Śrīndravarman (r. *c.* 1295–1307) was consecrated as Yuvarāja during the reign of Jayavarman VIII (1243–*c.* 1295). For this consecration in Indian sources see, e.g., a verse on occasions for the release of prisoners quoted without attribution by Vallabhadeva ad *Raghuvaṃśa* 17.19–20: *yuvarājābhiṣeke vā pararāṣṭrābhimardane / putrajanmani vā mokṣo bandhanasya vidhīyate* 'The release of prisoners is ordained when the crown prince is consecrated, when one invades another country, or when a son is born'; *Bhaṭṭikāvya* 12.501a: *kṛtābhiṣeko yuvarājarājye*; *Avadānaśataka* p. 209: *rājānaṃ vijñāpayām āsa anujānīhi māṃ tāta bhagavacchāsane pravrajiṣyāmīti. rājovāca na śakyam etan mayā kartuṃ yasmāt te yuvarājābhiṣeko na cireṇa bhaviṣyatīti*; and *Naimittikakarmānusandhāna* f. 84r5: *anenaiva vidhānena yuvarājābhiṣecanam*.

118. K. 806, v. 66: *āmṛtyā dhāraṇā ...kalaśaśatāt kāladhautāt patantyā / puṣye puṣye bhiṣikto*. For evidence of this regular consecration (*puṣyābhiṣekaḥ*, *puṣyasnānam*) among the Khmers see also K. 686, v. 19 (reign of Rājendravarman, 943/4–968).

119. For the procedure of this ceremony see Varāhamihira, *Bṛhatsaṃhitā* 47 (*puṣyasnānādhyāyaḥ*) following the elder Garga; *Viṣṇudharmottara* 2.152.2 and *Nīlamata* 810 (monthly); *Ādipurāṇa* ll. 2744–2745; *Atharvavedapariśiṣṭa* 5; *Satkarmaratnāvalī*, part 2, p. 518: *ayaṃ cābhiṣekaḥ prativarṣaṃ mahānavamyāṃ kartavyaḥ. puṣyābhiṣeko mahānavamyām indrotsavo janmadine prativarṣam ity ātharvaṇasūtrāt. iti puṣyābhiṣekaḥ* 'And this abhiṣeka should be done every year on Mahānavamī, because of the *Ātharvaṇasūtra*'s statement: "The Puṣyābhiṣeka every year on Mahānavamī and the Indra festival on [the king's] birthday." Thus the Puṣyābhiṣeka'. The "hundred" vases of the inscription were probably to be understood as 'shorthand' for the one hundred and eight of Garga's rule. That 'shorthand' is not uncommon in Sanskrit Śaiva sources.

120. See *Atharvavedapariśiṣṭa* (on the rituals to be performed for the king by his Atharvavedic priest [*rājapurohitaḥ*]) 30a (*laghulakṣahomaḥ*), 30b (*bṛhallakṣahomaḥ*), and 31 (*koṭihomaḥ*); *Viṣṇudharmottara* 2.152.6: *saṃvatsarāt koṭihomaṃ kuryāc ca ghṛtakambalam* 'after a year he should do the Koṭihoma and the Ghṛtakambala [= Puṣyābhiṣeka]'; 2.153.10: *asminn eva tathā kāle koṭihomaṃ samācaret / kārtikyāṃ tatsamāptis tu yathā bhavati bhārgava* 'O Bhārgava, he should do the Koṭihoma at this very time in such a way that it ends on the full-moon day of Kārtika'; *Ādipurāṇa* ll. 2801–2803 (= *Brahmapurāṇa* as quoted in the *Rājadharmakāṇḍa* of the *Kṛtyakalpataru* of Lakṣmīdhara, p. 109): *dvau lakṣahomau kurvīta tathā saṃvatsaraṃ prati / ekaṃ tu [ko]ṭihomaṃ tu yatnāt sarvābhayapradam / atharvavedavidhinā *sammantrya*

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

bhagavat pāda kamrateṅ añ gi ti añjeñ thve vraḥ koṭihoma vraḥ lakṣahoma vraḥ + + + homa vraḥ pitṛyajña vraḥ + + yajña sap saṃvatsara gi
K. 383, Khmer, ll. 33–35

Our Majesty [Sūryavarman I] invited [Our Lord the Venerable Guru Śrī Divākarapaṇḍita] to perform the annual Koṭihoma, Lakṣahoma, ...homa, Pitṛyajña, and ...yajña.[121]

Some idea of these fire-sacrifices may be formed from the many records in inscriptions and manuscripts of their performance for the Malla kings of the Kathmandu valley. A Newari document listing various rituals and the dates of their performance records two Koṭihomas for king Bhūpālendramalla of the independent kingdom of Kathmandu in 1693/4 and 1703/4 and tells us that the first lasted from the 6th of the dark half of Pauṣa to the 7th of the light half of Phālguna and the other from the 10th of the light half of Māgha to the 10th of the dark half of Phālguna, which is to say for forty-six and forty-five days respectively.[122] This means that the Homas must have proceeded at a rate of over 200,000 oblations (*āhutiḥ*) a day with numerous priests working simultaneously, each at his own fire. According to another Nepalese source, the *Lakṣakoṭihomaprayoga*, one should engage 4, 8 or 10 priests (*ṛtvik*) for a Lakṣahoma and 16, 20, 24, 64 or 100 for a Koṭihoma. This makes the frequent references in the Khmer Sanskrit inscriptions to their kings blocking out the light of the sun with the smoke of their countless sacrifices seem less like poetic exaggeration.[123]

Of the two annual Yajña ceremonies mentioned after the great Homas in the passage just cited, that whose name survives intact, the Pitṛyajña, is the annual Śrāddha ceremony,

---

(em. : *sammantryaṃ* Ed.) *ca [pu]rohitaiḥ* 'After consulting his domestic priests he should take care to do two Lakṣahomas and one Koṭihoma that bestows freedom from all dangers every year following the procedures of the Atharvaveda'; *Nīlamata* 813: *saṃvatsarasyātha kāryau lakṣahomau* (conj. : *kāryo lakṣahomo* Ed.) *mahīkṣitā / koṭihomas tathā kārya eka eva dvijottama / tayor vidhānaṃ vijñeyaṃ kalpeṣv ātharvaṇeṣu ca* 'The king, O best of brahmins, should do two Lakṣahomas and one Koṭihoma in the course of the year. Know that their procedure is [that taught] in the Kalpas of the Atharvaveda'.

121. Other references to the Koṭihoma and Lakṣahoma: K. 95, v. 28; K. 136 B, v. 6; K. 300, v. 20; K. 418 B; K. 528, v. 92; K. 692, v. 54; K. 806, v. 236, concerning Rājendravarman: *lakṣaśo lakṣahomāgnau hutaṃ yasyāpi hotṛbhiḥ*; K. 872, v. 13.

122. See the *thyā saphū* ('folded manuscript') 'A' transcribed in REGMI 1965–66, 3:37 and 44.

123. K. 95, v. 22 (Yaśovarman I); K. 136 B, v. 4 (Sūryavarman I); K. 235, v. 18 (Udayādityavarman II); K. 263 C, v. 20 (Jayavarman V); K. 279 B1, v. 4 (Yaśovarman I); K. 286, v. 21 (Jayavarman II); K. 323, v. 40 (Yaśovarman I); K. 432, v. 5 (Yaśovarman I); K. 528, v. 92 (Rājendravarman): *lakṣādhvarotthaiḥ sthagayadbhir āśā dhūmair niruddhārkakarākarair yaḥ / divaṃ ca śātakratavīṃ ca kīrtiṃ malīmasatvaṃ yugapan nināya* 'who simultaneously obscured the sky and the reputation of Indra with the clouds of smoke from his Lakṣahomas that filling the directions blocked out all the rays of the sun'; K. 528, v. 125 (Rājendravarman); K. 528, v. 154 (Rājendravarman); K. 677, v. 16 (Jayavarman IV); K. 806, v. 200 (Rājendravarman); K. 832, v. 5 (Yaśovarman I); K. 872, v. 13 (Rājendravarman): *yadyajñānala*dhūm*(corr. : *dhum* Ed.)*aughā lakṣahomādisambhavāḥ / meghāyante pade viṣṇos satataṅ kāmavarṣiṇaḥ* 'the masses of smoke in the domain of Viṣṇu produced by his offering fires in the Lakṣa- and other Homas are like clouds constantly raining down the fulfilment of his desires'. The 'domain of Viṣṇu' here is the sky. Cf. K. 235, v. 18.

Nepalese materials show that Śaiva and Śākta forms of these homas were developed, the brahmanical rituals being performed with non-Vedic mantras. One may ask, therefore, whether this may not also have been so among the Khmers. I think it was not. K. 806, v. 104, while not referring specifically to these two Homas speaks of the Homas of Rājendravarman as accomplished with the Mantras of the Vedas: *dhūmo ...yajñeṣu yasya ...jagāma ...divaṃ sadā vedamantraiḥ* 'in his sacrifices the smoke rose to heaven along with [the sound of] the Mantras of the Veda'.

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

in which offerings were presented through brahmins to the ancestors (*pitṛ-*), namely the three male ascendants of the patriline together with their spouses.

As for the other annual Yajña, whose name has been lost through damage, I propose that it was the Brahmayajña 'the offering to Brahmā'. It has long been assumed that this Yajña, which is mentioned several times in the inscriptions,[124] is that which is taught under this name as one of the five basic daily obligations (*pañca yajñāḥ*) of the twice-born in mainstream brahmanical texts: that is to say the figurative sacrifice (*yajñaḥ*) that is the daily recitation of a portion of the Vedas and other religious texts, otherwise called *svādhyāyaḥ*. This practice was certainly followed by Khmer brahmins. For example, we are told in an inscription of the reign of Sūryavarman I (1002–1050), that the ceremonial capital (*puram*) was loud with the sound of brahmins engaged in this daily chanting;[125] and one of the contexts in which the Brahmayajña is mentioned in the Khmer inscriptions does associate it with sacred knowledge, since we find it there as an event that marks the beginning or end of the period of study with a Guru. But I propose that it is a proper sacrificial ceremony that is intended, a *yajñaḥ* in the literal sense.

This conclusion is suggested by its occurrence in another context, in which it is paired with the *mātṛyajña* 'the sacrifice to the Mothers' as a preliminary rite performed on the site on which a Liṅga is about to be installed:

> *vraḥ kaṃsteṅ añ śrī lakṣmīpativarmma thve vrahmayajña mātṛyajña ta gi bhūmi noḥ nu pan-lyaṅ suvarṇnaliṅga ta vraḥ sureṅ pi vraḥ kaṃsteṅ añ kanlaḥ vnaṃ mok samayajña sanme ni pi jaṃnuṃ mahāpaṇḍitta phoṅ ta daṃnepra vraḥ kamrateṅ añ śrī vidyādhipaṇḍita gi ta guru ni ta vrahmayajña vraḥ kamrateṅ añ bhimapura ta thve mātṛyajña vraḥ kamrateṅ añ vlok ta panlyaṅ suvarṇnaliṅga.*
>
> Ka. 18 (*NIC* II-III:243, A ll. 18–20)

> V.Ka.A. Lakṣmīpativarma [caused to be] performed a Brahmayaj ña and a Mātṛyajña on this ground and then the golden Liṅga to be installed in the temple of Sureṅ. V.Ka.A. Kanlaḥ Vnaṃ came [there]. Men learned in the proper times [for rites] (*samayajña*) agreed (*sanme*) to make the offerings together (*ni pi jaṃnuṃ*), great scholars beginning with V.K.A. Śrī Vidyādhipaṇḍita, the Guru for the Brahmayajña. V.K.A. Bhīmapura celebrated the Mātṛyajña. V.K.A. Vlok [was the guru for] the installation of the golden Liṅga.'[126]

124. K. 216 S. v. 5; K. 235, Khmer, D l. 66; K. 352 Khmer, N l. 22; K. 353 S, Khmer, ll. 20–23; K. 444, Khmer, A ll. 5–9; K. 523, Khmer, D, ll. 14–17; K. 702, v. 23; Ka. 18, Khmer, A l. 3 and 18.

125. K. 1002 (JACQUES 1968), v. 33: *[śa]vdaśāstrādiniṣṇātaśavditānāṃ mahat puram / yasya svādhyāyaśavdena śavdabrahmamayaṃ yathā* 'whose great *puram* seemed to embody the Veda through the sound of the private daily recitations of scholars well-versed in grammar and the other Śāstras'.

126. Pou takes *mok* and *samayajña sanme ni pi jaṃnuṃ mahāpaṇḍitta phoṅ ta daṃnepra* ... together and translates as follows (with my interpretation of her parsing in parentheses): 'vint (*mok*) se joindre à ses sacrifices (*samayajña*) où furent assemblés (*sanme*) de grands savants, en premier ... (*mahāpaṇḍitta phon ta daṃnepra*)'. I have rejected this interpretation because her translation of *samayajña* 'to join in a sacrifice' creates an implausible hapax and renders *sanme ni pi jaṃnuṃ* 'agreed to make the offerings together' pleonastic. She avoids that problem by translating only *sanme* ('où furent assemblés'). I have preferred to take *samayajña* as Sanskrit *samaya-jña-*. This occurs frequently in religious contexts in the meaning 'one who knows the proper occasion'. See, e.g., *Mahābhārata* 4.27.6ab: *samayaṃ samayajñās te pālayantaḥ śucivratāḥ*. It also occurs in both Śaiva and Bhāgavata texts meaning 'one who knows the rules of the initiated', in the special sense of one who has received the first grade of initiation. This is probably not what is intended here, since these officiants would have had to have been fully initiated and consecrated, though one cannot exclude the possibility that the term was also applied to initiates in general.

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

and it is confirmed, I propose, in a Sanskrit verse cited immediately after the lacunose Old Khmer text that lists these ritual duties. For we learn that the royal preceptor (Vraḥ Guru) was invited to perform them "every year in accordance with [the following] Śloka [composed] by Our Lord Sūryavarmadeva [himself]" (*sap saṃvatsara gi roḥ vraḥ śloka vraḥ pāda kamrateṅ añ śrīsūryyavarmmadeva*):

– – d guror hutavahe havir āhutir yat
samyag vidher vividhāvṛṣṭibhavaṃ praśasyaṃ
sasyāya tad vidhividhāv iha koṭihome
koṭir hutis suvidhivat kurute grasiddhyai
K. 383, v. 2 (A ll. 35–36)

The verse is problematic. It is not just that its first two syllables have been lost. It is also that its meaning is obscured by grammatical incoherence and syntactic ambiguity. It is clear, however, that the verse refers to the benefits of three kinds of fire-sacrifice, which the context requires to be among those listed as the Vraḥ Guru's duties. The third is the Koṭihoma. The first is conveyed in the relative clause and the second in the correlative clause that follows it, ending *sasyāya tad vidhividhau*. The crucial word there is *vidhividhau*. CŒDÈS and DUPONT took it to mean 'in a ritual (*vidhau*) [performed] in accordance with injunction (*vidhi-*)'. But that is implausibly stilted Sanskrit for this sense and the passage so interpreted fails to provide the name of a sacrifice. There is a simple solution, which provides natural Sanskrit and satisfies the requirement of the context. That is to take *vidhividhau* in the meaning 'in the ceremony (*-vidhau*) of Brahmā', *vidhiḥ* begin a commonly used name of that deity.[127] The second sacrifice, then, is the Brahmayajña. This supports the restoration *vraḥ pitṛyajña vraḥ brahmayajña* in the Khmer prose (K. 383: *vraḥ pitṛyajña vraḥ + + yajña*), but it also demonstrates that the Brahmayajña was a literal rather than a figurative sacrifice. For though the Sanskrit is incorrect in composition or transcription, it is clear that the meaning intended is that the same offerings that are made into the fire in the first sacrifice bring about the various timely rains (*vividhavṛṣṭibhavaṃ*)[128] and so promote the grain harvest (*sasyāya*) in the second, that is to say, in the Brahmayajña.

There is also Old Javanese evidence for such a Brahmayajña. The *Deśawarṇana*, alias *Nāgarakṛtāgama*, completed in A.D. 1365 by Mpu Prapañca, Superintendent of Buddhist Affairs (*dharmādhyakṣa kasogatan*) at the court of Hayam Wuruk of Majapahit in East Java, refers to a *brahmayajña* in contexts that indicate that a ritual of worship rather than text recitation is intended. He tells us that the royal priest Śrījñānawidhi in performing the preliminaries to the postmortuary rites of the chief queen (*rājapatnī*) consecrated the ground for installation and in that context 'performed a *brahmayajña* as his offering (*pūjā*)';[129] and in an account of annual ceremonies for the welfare of the king he tells us that 'the Śaivas and Bauddhas performed the *homa* and *brahmayajña* as their offering (*pūjā*)'.[130] One could not refer to the *brahmayajñaḥ* in the figurative sense of text-recitation as a *pūjā*.

127. See, e.g., K. 692, v. 43d: *caturānano vidhir*; *Amarakośa* 1.1.17d (among synonyms of *brahmā*).

128. CŒDÈS and DUPONT give *vividhāvṛṣṭibhavaṃ*. I have corrected this because the metre requires the third syllable to be short. As for the solecisms in the rest of the verse, I have understood *havir āhutir* as *havir āhutaṃ* and *koṭir hutis* as *koṭir hutā*.

129. *Deśawarṇana* 67.3: *saṅ śrī jñānawidhi n lumakwani tĕhĕr mabrahmayajña n pamūjā*.

130. *Deśawarṇana* 83.6: *homa mwaṅ brahmayajñenulahakĕn ira saṅ śewa boddha n pamūjā*. It may be relevant that the centre-point of any ritual ground (*yāgabhūmiḥ*) is known as the 'place of Brahmā' (*brahmasthānam*); see, e.g., Bhojadeva, *Siddhāntasārapaddhati*, f. 6r (on entering the shrine for worship): *brahmasthāne oṃ vāstoṣpataye brahmaṇe nama iti puṣpaṃ dattvā* ... One of the principal rites in the preparation of a site is the *Vāstupūjā*, the presentation of offerings to the deities of the 64 or 81

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

No details of the ritual are recorded. But among the supplements (*pariśiṣṭam*) of the *Atharvaveda*, short tracts which set out the ritual duties of the king's personal priest, there is one (19b) that gives the procedure of a *brahmayāgaḥ*. Since *yāgaḥ* and *yajñaḥ* are synonymous and since no other applicable *brahmayajñaḥ/brahmayāgaḥ* is taught in the brahmanical literature known to me, it seems at least probable that the Khmer and Javanese ceremonies were derived from it. In this Brahmā is worshipped in a Maṇḍala in a pavilion (*maṇḍapaḥ*) constructed for this purpose, a platform (*vediḥ*) is made to its south or west, a fire-sacrifice is celebrated and an *abhiṣekaḥ* given [to the king on that platform]. This is followed by the feeding of learned brahmins and the needy, the offering of a nocturnal *gaṇabaliḥ*, worship of the domestic deities, festivities in the palace, the feeding of Yogins and householders in their homes, and the usual markers of royal ceremonies in the civic domain: the temporary banning of the cutting down of trees and the butchering of animals, and the proclamation of a general amnesty throughout the kingdom. Finally the king should venerate his Guru. The benefits are said to be long life and the extension of the king's realm.[131]

Other brahmanical rituals are encountered in the inscriptions. We have seen that a Mātṛyajña is said to have been performed as a preliminary ritual on the site on which a Liṅga was to be installed. I propose that this was the worship of the Mother-goddesses (*mātṛkāpūjā*) that is prescribed in Indian brahmanical sources as a preliminary rite in such ceremonies as rites of passage (*saṃskāraḥ*) and the consecration of homes or temples (*pratiṣṭhā*).[132]

There is also the first of the three annual sacrifices mentioned in the Sanskrit verse attributed to Sūryavarman I. Though the Sanskrit is lacunose and somewhat incoherent (– – *d guror hutavahe havir āhutir yat*) it is very probable that this was a *guruhomaḥ*, a sacrifice [in honour] of the Guru. Against this conjecture is the absence of any reference to a sacrifice with this name in brahmanical literature. But in its support is the fact that elsewhere in these inscriptions a royal Guru is described as *gurukoṭihomahotā*.[133] CŒDÈS took this to mean 'who performed the Koṭihoma for his Guru'. But this is highly implausible, since the Koṭihoma is a sacrifice performed for kings. The alternative is to take the compound to mean 'who performed the Guruhoma and the Koṭihoma'. In that case this ceremony too should be among those listed in the Khmer prose as the annual duties of the royal Guru. If so, it can only have been the third Homa of the list. Against this conclusion is the fact that CŒDÈS and DUPONT judge there to be a lacuna of three syllables in the text where its name is given (*vraḥ + + + homa*) while the restoration *vraḥ guruhoma* supplies only two (*guru-*). However, this objection is not decisive. For *guru* has the trisyllabic *ācārya* as a frequently used synonym. I propose, therefore, the restoration *vraḥ ācāryahoma*.

We also hear of the brahmanical practice of the daily pouring of libations of water to the ancestors (*pitṛtarpaṇam*). For in an inscription of 667 A.D. Siṃhadatta, the devout Śaiva physician of Jayavarman I, is praised as follows:

---

compartments of the square Maṇḍala of the Site (*vāstumaṇḍalam*) drawn upon it. Brahmā is worshipped with the presentation of various foods in the central four or nine compartments; see, e.g, *Somaśambhupaddhati* 4:55 and 57, vv. 83ab and 89c–91b.

131. *Atharvavedapariśiṣṭa* 19.1.1–19.5.9. I propose the following emendations to the published text: *pūrayed varṇakaiḥ* for *pūjayed varṇakaiḥ* in 19.2.1; and *madhyepadmaṃ tu saṃsthāpya brahmāṇaṃ* for *madhye padmaṃ tu saṃsthāpya brahmāṇaṃ* in 19.2.5.

132. On the *mātṛkāpūjā* in this context see SANDERSON 1990, 62.

133. K. 692 of 1189/90 or 1195/6, v. 54.

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

śivayajñena yo devān munīn addhyayanena ca
pitṛṃś cātarppayat toyais satputrakaranissṛtaiḥ
K. 53, v. 23

He satisfied the gods through his worship of Śiva, the sages through his recitation of sacred texts, and the ancestors through libations of water poured from the hands of a virtuous son.

That this refers to the daily libations that brahmanical tradition requires is not stated explicitly; but it is implied by the context, since the other two obligations, those of worship and reciting the scriptures, are daily duties. By speaking of these libations as poured from the hands of his son the author conveys that he has fulfilled his duty to the ascendants of his patriline, not merely by pouring the libations himself, which goes without saying since this is among the daily duties of any brahmin male, but also by fathering a son, since without a son to follow on the offerings to the ancestors would be interrupted.[134]

Postfunerary rituals other than the annual Pitṛyajña are mentioned. We are told of Śrāddhas performed for the benefit of persons who have died leaving no-one to make these offerings to them. An inscription reports that a Śaiva hermitage abandoned in A.D. 949/50 had been restored by four men without heirs on the condition that their Śrāddhas would be performed by the head (*pādamūla*) of the hermitage;[135] and the foundation stele of one of the hermitages founded by Yaśovarman I rules that balls of rice (*piṇḍam*) must be offered [by the officiant] to persons who have died leaving no-one to make their postfunerary offerings (*apiṇḍāḥ*).

ye bhaktyā patitā yuddhe ye ca bhaktāḥ parāsavaḥ
apiṇḍāḥ kṛpaṇānāthavālavṛddhāś ca ye mṛtāḥ
eteṣām eva sarvveṣāñ caturāḍhakatandulaiḥ
māsāvasāne sarvvatra piṇḍaiḥ kurvvīta tarppaṇam
etasminn āśrame piṇḍaṅ kṛtvānīya ca sarvvaśaḥ
yaśodharataṭākānte tasminn eva tu nirvvapet
K. 279 C1, vv. 13–15

At the end of every month he should use four āḍhaka measures of rice to satisfy with rice-balls all the following: those who have fallen in battle out of loyalty [to the king], deceased loyal [servants of the crown], and the wretched, the unprotected, children and the elderly, who have died without anyone to offer them the postfunerary rice-balls. He should prepare the rice-balls in this hermitage, and then take them and offer them at the edge of the Yaśodhara reservoir.[136]

134. The verse invokes the brahmanical doctrine of the three debts from which a twice-born male must free himself before he is entitled to retire from the world. There are two views expressed as to how he is to clear his debt to his ancestors: (1) by making the postfunerary offerings to them, and (2) by fathering offspring. The first is seen in *Mahābhārata* 12.281.9c–10c: *ṛṇavāñ jāyate martyas tasmād anṛṇatāṃ vrajet / svādhyāyena maharṣibhyo devebhyo yajñakarmaṇā / pitṛbhyaḥ śrāddhadānena* 'Mortals are born with debts [to the great sages, the gods and their ancestors]. Therefore they should free themselves of them, through the daily recitation of the sacred texts, the rituals of sacrifice and the giving of postfunerary offerings'. The second is seen in *Baudhāyanadharmasūtra* 2.6.11.33: *jāyamāno vai brāhmaṇas tribhir ṛṇavā jāyate brahmacaryeṇa ṛṣibhyo yajñena devebhyaḥ prajayā pitṛbhya iti* 'The brahmin is born with three debts: to the sages, to the gods, and to his ancestors [, which he clears] by studying the scriptures, by offering sacrifices, and by fathering offspring' and in *Manusmṛti* 6.35–37. Our inscription combines these two views.

135. K. 215, ll. 16–17: *āyātta ta pādamūla leṅ nirvvāpa neḥ dharmma yeṅ* 'It is the responsibility of the officiant to perform the Śrāddha offerings of this foundation'.

136. This is the vast Yaśodharataṭāka (approx. 7 km. by 1.8 km [JACQUES 1999, 55]), now known as the Eastern Baray, excavated by Yaśovarman I at his newly founded capital Yaśodharapura (Angkor).

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

In discussing the group of stelae of which this is one Barth states that there is nothing in Indian Smṛti texts corresponding to this provision by the king for Śrāddha offerings for such persons, holding that the Indian rule is that only a relative of the deceased may perform the rite.[137] But that he was mistaken is clear from *Brahmapurāṇa* 220.78c–79b:

sarvābhāve striyaḥ kuryuḥ svabhartṛṇām amantrakam
tadabhāve ca nṛpatiḥ kārayet tv akuṭumbinām

If there is no-one else, women should do [the Śrāddha] for their husbands if they have no family, [but] without the Mantras; and if there is no wife then the king should have it done for them.

The principal here is that the heir and the person with the duty to make the postfunerary offerings are one and the same. In the absence of all others the king inherits the property of the deceased except, says Manu, in the case of a brahmin, whose property may never be taken by the king but must be given to a brahmin, preferably one learned in the Vedas. That these rules are relevant to the question of who has the responsibility to make the offerings is apparent from the fact that Vijñāneśvara quotes the passage of the *Manusmṛti* that states them (9.188–189) in this context ad *Yājñavalkyasmṛti* 2.135–136.

Moreover, the case of the heirless individuals who had restored a foundation on the condition that its head should make their Śrāddha offerings (K. 215, ll. 16–17) may be understood as an application of the rule that in the absence of a son or close relative the Ācārya of the deceased may make the offerings.[138]

We hear also of a Homa performed by the royal preceptor Divākarabhaṭṭa for the deceased queen Mahendradevī on the twelfth day after her death, an office for which her husband Rājendravarman rewarded him with the gift of two villages.

894 śaka pūrṇṇamī phālguṇa nu vraḥ kamrateṅ añ divākarabhaṭṭa nivedana ta dhūli vraḥ pāda dhūli jeṅ vraḥ kamrateṅ [añ śrī] jayavarmmadeva ḳāla samrāc homa dvādaśarātrī vraḥ pāda [vraḥ ā]jñā kanloṅ kamrateṅ añ ° riy sruk kandin nu sruk supurāya pramān pūrvvadiśa ° ta gi dhūlī vraḥ pāda dhūlī jeṅ vraḥ kamrateṅ añ stāc dau śivaloka oy vraḥ karuṇā prasāda ta vraḥ kamrateṅ añ [divāka]rabhaṭṭa neḥ sruk ta anle 2 gi pi vraḥ kamrateṅ añ + + + + + vraḥ dakṣiṇā phley srāc dvādaśarātrī
K. 668 B, ll. 1–8

In Śaka 894, on the full-moon day of Phālguṇa V.K.A. Divākarabhaṭṭa informs D.V.P.D.J.V.K.A. Śrī Jayavarmadeva that on the occasion of his completing the Homa of the twelfth day for V.P.V.A. the deceased queen [Mahendradevī] K.A., Sruk Kandin and Sruk Supurāya in the Pūrvadiśa District were given to V.K.A. Divākarabhaṭṭa by the favour of D.V.P.D.J.V.K.A. the king who has gone to Śivaloka [Rājendravarman]. These two Sruks V.K.A. [Divākarabhaṭṭa received as (?)] his sacred dakṣiṇā as the result of the completion of [the rites of] the twelfth day.

This was no doubt a Homa in connection with the offering of the first Ekoddiṣṭa Śrāddha after the period of eleven days of postmortuary impurity (*āśaucam*) had ended,[139] though

137. See BARTH in BERGAIGNE 1893, 414.

138. *Mitākṣarā* p. 223 ad *Yājñavalkyasmṛti* 2.135–136: *bandhūnām abhāve ācāryaḥ. tadabhāve śiṣyaḥ. putrābhāve yaḥ pratyāsannaḥ sapiṇḍaḥ. tadabhāve ācāryaḥ. ācāryasyābhāve 'ntevāsīty āpastambasmaraṇāt* 'In the absence of kin the Ācārya. In his absence a pupil [of the Ācārya], in accordance with the teaching of Āpastamba: "in the absence of a son a close Sapiṇḍa relative, in his absence the Ācārya, and in the absence of the Ācārya a pupil".'

139. After the period of impurity (*āśaucakālaḥ*) ends the deceased receives his or her first Ekoddiṣṭa Śrāddha on the twelfth day after death and others after a month and a month and a half and every month

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

in the absence of further information we cannot know whether the ritual was conducted in its purely brahmanical form. Given the prevalence of Śaiva initiation it is possible that the queen's postmortuary rites were performed in the parallel form that the Śaivas elaborated for their own initiates.[140]

Brahmanism, then, was certainly present among the Khmers, at least within the élite of society. But I see no evidence that it amounted to a fourth religion. The Indian Śaivas claimed to go beyond Brahmanism through practice authorized by their own, higher bodies of scripture; but they underwent Brahmanism's rites of passage, performed many of its regular ceremonies in addition to their own, and adhered to its regulations concerning such matters as caste-endogamy, inheritance, and the administration of law under royal authority. Only their path to salvation was peculiarly theirs. The Brahmanism that we find among the Khmers was of this subsidiary kind. There is no trace of the exclusive variety that many in India considered to be the sole means of access to salvation, denying the validity of the Śaiva and Vaiṣṇava scriptures.

What is more, the subsidiary Brahmanism of the Khmers was less substantial than that of their Indian co-religionists. Its influence did not penetrate to those levels that provided the primary criteria of brahmanical orthopraxy in India. The Khmers eagerly adopted the etiquette and ceremonial of the Indian courts; they cremated their dead; and they allowed India to influence their personal habits, avoiding the left hand in eating, and cleaning their teeth with toothsticks;[141] but they did not adopt Brahmanism's dietary preferences and taboos, except in the case of special restrictions adopted by Śaiva ascetics.[142] Thus we have two inscriptions in meditation caves that speak of such ascetics living on a diet of milk, a practice attested in Indian Śaiva sources;[143] but reliefs on the wall of the Bayon

---

after that until a full year has elapsed. Then the deceased (*pretaḥ*) becomes an ancestor (*pitā*) through the Sapiṇḍīkaraṇa ritual and from then on receives annual Pārvaṇa Śrāddhas, unless the deceased is a woman without a son. In that case she does not join the ancestors through the Sapiṇḍīkaraṇa and receives an annual Ekoddiṣṭa rather than Pārvaṇa Śrāddha. See, e.g., *Brahmapurāṇa* 220.64–75.

140. On the Śaiva rites for the dead and their relation with their brahmanical prototypes see SANDERSON 1995, 31–36.

141. See MABBETT and CHANDLER 1996, 128, 129 and 133. Information on Khmer funerary practice is meagre. According to a passage in the official history of the Sui Dynasty (*Suishu*), covering the years 581–617 and compiled during the years 629–636, that is included in Ma Duanlin's *Wenxian tongkao*, an encyclopaedic history of institutions published in A.D. 1317, cremation was the norm though there were some who simply exposed their dead (translation in CŒDÈS 1968, 76). In Zhou Daguan's memoir, based on his visit in A.D. 1296–7 and published at some time before 1312 (PELLIOT 1951, 37–38) it is exposure that is reported as the norm. He notes that cremation was gradually increasing, but mostly among the descendants of Chinese (PELLIOT 1951, 24). The difference between the two reports is probably the result of the different perspectives of the two divisions of Khmer society, that of the common people, who exposed their dead, and that of the élite, who cremated theirs following Indian rites. The *Suishu* says that the dead were attended either by Buddhist monks and nuns or by Taoist priests. The latter term is probably a reference to Śaiva ascetics. Excavations at Nen Chua and Go Thap in the Mekong Delta have uncovered brick-lined chambers containing cremated human remains with gold leaves showing brahmanical symbols and other mortuary offerings. Radiocarbon dates suggest occupation during the periods A.D. 450–650 for the former and A.D. 400–600 for the latter (HIGHAM 2001, 29–31).

142. Similarly REID (1988, 34–35) points to the fact that brahmanical dietary rules "had little practical effect in restricting sources of protein" among the Javanese.

143. K. 156 (10th century), v. 10cd, concerning the ascetic Kambu: *gurudevāgnisadbhaktir ācāryyaḥ kṣīrabhug yamī* 'an ascetic [Śaiva] Ācārya living on milk, truly devoted to his Guru, his deity, and the sacred fire'; v. 16ab: *kṣīrāśī yo *mahātejāḥ* (corr. : *mahātejā* Ep.) *pūjyaś śrīkamvubhūbhṛtām* 'an illustrious eater of milk, venerated by the kings of Kambu'. K. 481 (9th century), v. 4, tells us of another such Śaiva ascetic inhabiting the cave Indraguhā 'who adhered to the ascetic observance of Sadāśiva [=

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

temple of Jayavarman VII (r. 1181–*c.* 1210) depict fishing with nets and a kitchen in which two cooks are about to plunge a whole pig into a boiling cauldron; and Chinese sources report that the Khmers' diet included cakes soaked in meat gravy and that they reared chicken, ducks, sheep and geese.[144] The *Manusmṛti*, the foremost brahmanical authority on such matters, enjoins the avoidance of fish and strictly prohibits the eating of the meat of the domestic pig or hen, saying that any twice-born person who eats these loses his caste.[145]

Indeed inscriptions show that pork, goat and fish were eaten by the Khmers even in religious feasts. Thus on the occasion of the erecting of boundary-stones in 1089 an inscription records a donation of food that includes two pigs and four goats;[146] and an inscription of the reign of Sūryavarman I (1002–*c.* 1050) speaks of a feast that required two-thousand bowls, two pigs, eight hundred large fish, and an unstated quantity of beer (*surā*).[147]

This too was a feast in a religious context. The purpose of the inscription is to record a royal decree requiring [the head of] a hermitage and the dignitaries (*pradhāna*) of two localities to pay with land for the equipment and materials (*kriyā*) of a *vraḥ rudraśānti*. The foods and utensils are part of what was received for that purpose. In his edition of this

---

Suśiva], [sustaining himself by] drinking [only] milk' (*kṣīraṃ piban ...suśivavratasthaḥ*). For this voluntary dietary restriction in Indian Śaivism see *Niśvāsaguhya* f. 82r1: *devaṃ pūjyāgnau juhuyād auḍumbarasamidhānāṃ tryaktānāṃ sahasraṃ trisandhyaṃ kṣīrāśī sapta dināni juhuyāt. cīrṇavidyāvrato bhavati* 'At each of three junctures of the day after he has worshipped Śiva he should make offerings into the fire of a thousand sticks of Uḍumbara wood smeared with the three [sweet substances: milk, butter and sugar]. He should do this fire-sacrifice for seven days living on milk. He will then have completed the observance of his Mantra'; *Niśvāsakārikā* 60.35 concerning the *vāgīśvarīvratam*: *śālipiṣṭalabhuñjānaḥ kṣīrabhuk sādhakeśvaraḥ / māsam ekaṃ vrataṃ kuryāt sarvakāmaprasiddhaye* 'Eating rice-flour [or] consuming [only] milk the excellent masterer of Mantras should practice the observance for one month in order to achieve his every desire'; *Picumata* 21.95: *cared devyāvrataṃ hy etan nirācāro jitendriyaḥ / atha vā kṣīrabhojī syād ghṛtaprāśanam ārabhet* 'Free of orthopraxy, with his senses under control, he should practice this observance of the Goddess. Either he should live on milk; or he should eat clarified butter'; *Gorakṣaśataka* 53c–54: *kaṭvamlalavaṇatyāgī kṣīrabhojanam ācaret / brahmacārī mitāhārī tyāgī yogaparāyaṇaḥ / abdād ūrdhvaṃ bhavet siddho nātra kāryā vicāraṇā* 'Giving up salt and pungent and astringent foods he should live on milk. Celibate, eating little, abandoning all attachments and intent on meditation he will achieve his goal after a year. Of this there should be no doubt'. Similarly K. 91 (no earlier than the reign of Jayavarman VI [1080–1107]) tells us that the Kavīśvarapaṇḍita, the Guru and counsellor of Sūryavarman I, followed the religious discipline of the Pañcarātra and lived on clarified butter: *vraḥ kamrateṅ añ srī kavīśvarapaṇḍita ąji mātṛpakṣa [ye]ṅ mān śīla pañcarātra *ghṛtāhāra* (corr. : *ghrnāhāra* CŒDÈS).

144. See GITEAU 1976, 35b–38a; and ibid. fig. 28 and fig. 92 for the scenes of fishing and of the kitchen with the whole pig. The rearing of chickens on temple land is forbidden in K. 367, l. 10.

145. *Manusmṛti* 5.12ab; 5.14cd; 5.15cd; 5.19: *chatrākaṃ viḍvarāhaṃ ca laśunaṃ grāmakukkuṭam / palāṇḍuṃ gṛñjanaṃ caiva matvā jagdhvā pated dvijaḥ* 'a twice-born person who knowingly eats mushrooms, the domestic pig, garlic, the domestic hen, onion or *the red onion (?) will certainly lose his caste'. This is considered equal to the major sin (*mahāpātakam*) of drinking alcoholic liquor (*surāpānam*); see *Manusmṛti* 11.56.

146. K. 258 A. l. 23: *kriyā jrvak 2 vave 4 raṅko thlvaṅ 5 marīca qvar 2* 'food [that I gave]: 2 pigs, 4 goats, 5 thlvaṅ of husked rice, 2 qvar of pepper'.

147. K. 353 N. ll. 31–33: *jrvak 2 (32) ti saṃlāp pi oy pāy raṅko thlvaṅ 5 ti taṃtāṃ tṛ aruṅ slik 2 khāl slik 5 ceḥ 5 dlaḥ 6 (33) vāṅ dik surā saṃlo sthāli* ... '2 pigs to be slaughtered for food; 800 big fish; 2000 bowls; five jars; 6 metal cooking-pots; water-jars (?); beer; meat gravy (*saṃlo*); *sñi* pots; ... '. Zhou Daguan reports four types of fermented drinks consumed by the Khmers, made from mixing water and an agent of fermentation with (1) honey, (2) certain leaves, (3) rice, and (4) sugar; see PELLIOT 1951, 29.

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

inscription CŒDÈS is not sure whether the words *vraḥ rudraśānti* name a dignitary or a temple.[148] But what is referred to here is neither a person nor a temple. It is a Śaiva ceremony. The purpose of a Rudraśānti ritual is to counter ills of all kinds but above all national disasters, epidemics and famines. Its procedure (*kalpaḥ*) and myth of origin (*itihāsaḥ*) are the subject of a chapter of the Śaiva scripture *Bṛhatkālottara*;[149] and an abbreviated redaction of the section on the procedure has been incorporated in the *Agnipurāṇa* (*Adhyāya* 324). The foodstuffs and beer were evidently required for a feast held at the conclusion of a performance of this ritual, probably at some time of widespread distress. Such feeding, of brahmins and others, is, as is well known, a required subsidiary of all major Indic rituals, and in apotropaic rituals of whatever scale. This too, then, would have been a religious rather than a secular feast.[150]

Khmer patterns of kinship, inheritance and property-rights also remained largely unaffected. The passing of office from a man to his sister's son seems to have been the norm among Khmer brahmins, and it remained widespread even in royal lineages, where patrilineal succession did make inroads.[151]

Women, moreover, appear as owners and disposers of property in their own right, a role from which Indian brahmanical tradition excluded them.[152] Thus K. 216 S of A.D. 1006/7 reports that Madhyadeśā, a woman in service at the court, donated land and other property to her Guru after a Brahmayajña, and yet other lands to the Śiva installed at Śivapāda; and the Khmer portion of this inscription lists slaves given by two men to Teṅ Umā, the granddaughter of Madhyadeśā; K. 165 N of A.D. 953 records that Me Indrānī, Me Devakī and Me Neṃ, three female members of the family of Tāñ Kaṃrateṅ Añ Mahendradevī joined with Vāp Pañ, the chief (*mūla*) of the corps of Bhāgavata servants,

148. *IC* 5:134, n. 2. Names in -śānti are not uncommon in the inscriptions, e.g. Kumāraśānti (K. 1), Jñāṇaśānti (K. 21), Bhavaśānti (K. 657), Bhāśānti (K. 561) and Śikhāśānti (K. 382).

149. *Bṛhatkālottara*, ff. 85v3–90v6: *rudraśāntipaṭalaḥ*. On the purpose of the ceremony see f. 87r2–v3: *rudraśāntiṃ pravakṣyāmi śivāṃ sarvārthasādhanīm / mānuṣāṇāṃ hitārthāya samaṃ rudreṇa bhāṣitām / sarvvavighnāḥ praṇaśyanti śrutvaināṃ pāpanāśanīm / duḥsvapnā vyādhayaś caiva grahāś caiva diśo daśa / .....rudraśāntiṃ namasyāmi vetālānāṃ vināśanīm / narāṇām upasṛṣṭānāṃ devāyatana-veśmasu / yeṣāṃ na garbhasaṃbhūtiḥ . kulahāniś ca jāyate / yatra jātā vinaśyanti bhavanti ca napuṃsakāḥ / mārī cotpādyate yatra satataṃ ca gṛhe grahāḥ / garbhaḥ pataty akāle ca rudraṃ vā yatra jāyate / durbhikṣeṇaiva pīḍyante rāṣṭrotpātaiś ca dāruṇaiḥ / gaṇā yatra virudhyante bhrātaraś cāpy anekaśaḥ / pitā *mātā* (corr. : *mātās* Cod.) *tathā caiva kandalopahate gṛhe / paśyanti ca kapiṃ svapne bījaṃ kṣetre na rohati / gāvo tha paśavaś caiva dāsāḥ karmakarā api / gṛhe sthitā virudhyante tatra śāntiṃ prayojayet / kūpo vā garjjate yatra pṛṣṭhavaṃśaś ca bhidyate / taravo nāhatāś caiva sravanti rudhiraṃ bahu / devatāś caiva vṛkṣāś ca nṛtyanti ca hasanti ca / akāle puṣpitā vṛkṣāḥ phalitāś cāpy anekaśaḥ / ulkāpātāś ca jāyante bhūmikampāś ca dāruṇāḥ / nimittair aśubhair ebhir anyaiś cāpi sudāruṇaiḥ / ekāgraḥ* (corr. : *ekāgraṃ* Cod.) *prayato bhūtvā tatra śāntiṃ prayojayet*. However, the Newar *Rudraśānti* mentions only national calamities, epidemics and famines, f. 19r5: *dvīpamārī-mahotpātaśāntyarthaṃ*; f. 19r9–v1: *mahājanakṣayapraśāntyarthaṃ deśotpāṭamahāmārībhayaśānty-arthaṃ*; and f. 26v8: *iti śrīrudrasānti mahāmāridurbhikṣapraśāntividhiṃ samāptā*.

150. See, e.g., *Śāṅkhāyanagṛhyasūtra* 1.2.1: *karmāpavarge brāhmaṇabhojanam* 'at the close of the ritual the feeding of brahmins [should take place]'. For the case of apotropaic rites (*śāntividhiḥ*) see the *Yājñavalkyasmṛti* 1.295–308 (*grahaśāntiprakaraṇam*). The Newar *Rudraśānti* Paddhati likewise rules a meal (*samayabhojya*) as the last act of the proceedings, after the dismissing of the deity from the fire and the presentation of offerings to virgin girls (f. 23v7–8): *agnivisarjana yāya. kaumāriyāga. samayabhojya. iti śrīrudraśānti* ... For the meaning of *samayabhojya* see MANANDHAR 1986 s.v. *samay/samae/*, TAMOT 2000 s.v. *smaya, samaya dyāhā*, ISWARANAND 1995, s.v. *samae*, and LEVY 1990, 326, 642 (*samhae*).

151. See Adhir CHAKRAVARTI 1982; VICKERY 1998, 258–270.

152. *Manusmṛti* 8.416a: *bhāryā putraś ca dāsaś ca traya eādhanāḥ smṛtāḥ* 'Three are held to be without property: a wife, a son [before partition] and a slave'.

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

to install a [Viṣṇu] Cāmpeśvara in Dvāravatī and to unite its personnel with that of another deity of this name; and K. 692 of A.D. 1189/90 or 1195/6 tells us that when Sūryapaṇḍitasabhāpati (Bhūpendrapaṇḍita II) installed images of both his parents he did so in conjunction with his wife.[153]

We also find evidence that women could officiate as priests. We learn that when there was no available male in a lineage of Bhāgavatas designated to supply the presiding officiant of the Viṣṇu temple at Kadeṅ, a woman of the family was to be ordained for that purpose.[154] Nor is it probable that this arrangement was exceptional among the Khmers, for we find it also in the royal Śaiva cult of the Devarāja. In the Sdok Kak Thom inscription of A.D. 1053, to which we owe most of our knowledge of this cult, we are told that after its inauguration by king Jayavarman II around the turn of the eight and ninth centuries he and the brahmin Hiraṇyadāma agreed that the right to conduct the worship of the god should pass from Śivakaivalya to men or women in his maternal line:

tanmātṛvaṃśe yatayas striyo vā
jātā ∪ – – tra niyuktabhāvāḥ
tadvājakās syur na kathañcid anya
iti kṣitīndradvijakalpanāsīt
K. 235, v. 31

The king and the foremost of brahmins provided that ascetics or women born in his [Śivakaivalya's] maternal lineage, and no others under any circumstances, should be appointed to this ...and perform its worship.

CŒDÈS and DUPONT chose to translate this passage in a manner that eliminates reference to the right of women by taking *striyo* not as a nominative plural ('ascetics *or* women born in his maternal lineage') but as an ablative singular ('ascetics born *from* a woman in his maternal lineage'). But this asks us to accept an unnaturally stilted use of Sanskrit in an inscription whose Sanskrit is otherwise of a high standard of correctness

153. K. 692, v. 57: *asthāpayad bhagavatīṃ jananīṃ satīṃ śrībhūpendrapaṇḍitapituḥ padapāṅsu-lavdhyai / śrīsūryyapaṇḍitasabhāpatir ātmarūpaṃ bhaktyaitayos sahakalatram atiṣṭh[i]pad yaḥ.*

154. K. 989 B, ll. 10–11 (of A.D. 1007) referring to an edict of Jayavarman II (r. *c.* A.D. 770–*c.* 834) concerning the Vaiṣṇava temple of the God of Kadeṅ (*kamrateṅ jagat kadeṅ*): *vraḥ śāsana pre santāna steṅ rau ta phjuḥ purohita kamrateṅ jagat kadeṅ ° daha qyat santāna ta puruṣa (11) ley strijana ta qvyaḥ mān rtusnāta lah ta vvaṃ rtusnāta ley lah pvās bhāgavatī pre phjuḥ kamrateṅ jagat kadeṅ* 'A royal edict [of Jayavarman II] ordered that the descendants of Steṅ Rau should serve as the officiants (*purohita*) of the God of Kadeṅ, and if there is no male descendant that a woman who is *qvyaḥ*, who has bathed after menstruation or who has not, should be ordained as a Bhāgavatī (a female Bhāgavata) and serve the God of Kadeṅ'. CŒDÈS (tr., *IC* 7, 183) understood *rtusnāta lah ta vvaṃ rtusnāta ley lah* to mean 'nubiles ou non nubiles'. VICKERY rightly finds fault with this rendering and proposes instead 'women who no longer menstruate or who have not begun to menstruate' (1998, 220, 419–420), taking *qvyaḥ* to mean 'finished with' and apparently having it govern *rtusnāta*. However, that too is unsatisfactory, however well it accords with anthropological expectations about menstruation taboos, since it is implausible that prepubertal girls were ordained as temple priests. The Sanskrit term *rtusnāta-* adopted by Old Khmer refers to a woman who has bathed at the end of the five days of impurity caused by her menstruation and is thereby considered ready to conceive, it being obligatory for the husband to attempt to proceate a son at this time; see, e.g., *Parāśarasmṛti* quoted by Kullūka ad *Manusmṛti* 3.45: *rtusnātāṃ tu yo bhāryāṃ sannidhau nopagacchati / ghorāyāṃ bhrūṇahatyāyāṃ patate nātra saṃśayaḥ*; Trilocanaśiva, *Prāyaścittasamuccaya* p. 52: *ṛtusnātā yādā patnī tadā pañcadināvadhi / seyyā vipreṇa putrārtham anyathā bhrūṇahā bhavet*. I tentatively propose, therefore, that *rtusnāta* here is extended to mean 'of child-bearing age' and that accordingly *vvaṃ rtusnāta* means 'no longer of child-bearing age'.

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

and lucidity; and, more conclusively, it overlooks the crucial word *vā* ('or'). Women, then, had the right to serve as priests, if only in the absence of a qualified male.[155]

It seems, moreover, that high-born women were not barred by their gender from access to all positions in the administration. We learn that after the death of king Rājendravarman (r. 944–*c.* 968) Prāṇā, the daughter of his sister, was put in charge of the private secretaries of his successor Jayavarman V (r. *c.* 968–*c.* 1000/1).[156]

As for caste, adherence to which is so central an element of brahmanical orthopraxy in India, our sources use its language to distinguish between brahmins and the 'kṣatriya' rulers they served; but marriage between brahmin men and women of the Khmer royal families was common, as it was in the neighbouring principalities of the Chams, kings of both peoples boasting of brahmin-kṣatriya descent;[157] and most of the rest of society is referred to without caste-differentiation as 'the common people' (*sāmānyajanaḥ*, *sāmānyāḥ*):[158]

rājakuṭyantare rājadvijātinṛpasūnavaḥ
viśeyur atra nirddoṣan ta evābharaṇānvitāḥ
tadanyas tu sasāmānyajano noddhataveṣaṇaḥ
K. 95 A, v. 39–41b

Only the king, brahmins and the prince(s) may enter this royal house of retreat wearing their ornaments without fault. Others than they, and the common people, should not be dressed in finery.

and, in the Lolei inscription of Yaśovarman I (r. 889–910) prescribing the punishments that should be meted out to those who infringe the rules of conduct in a hermitage:

78 *ye śāsanam idan darppāl laṅghayeyur yyadi dvijāḥ*
vadhadaṇḍādyanarhatvān nirvvāsyās ta ito ṅganāt
79 *rājaputrās tu dāpyās te hemaviṅśatpalair mmitam*
tadarddhavinayaḥ kāryyo nṛpatijñātimantriṇām

155. Cœdès and Dupont 1943–46, 96: '« Que les yatis nés d'une femme de ce mātṛvaṃça et préposés... ici, soient prêtres de ce culte et jamais d'autres ! » Telle fut la règle des brahmanes royaux'. I also reject their translation of *kṣitīndradvija-* as 'brahmanes royaux' (literally 'king-brahmins'). This too is implausible. The preferable alternative ('the king *and* the foremost of brahmins') fits the context perfectly and is supported by the Old Khmer parallel in ll. 76–77 of side 3: *vraḥ pāda parameśvara nu vrāhmaṇa hiraṇyadāma oy vara śāpa pre santāna steṅ aṅ śivakaivalya gi ta siṅ nā kamrateṅ jagat ta rāja vvaṃ āc ti mān qnak ta dai ti ta siṅ ta noḥh* 'V.P. Parameśvara [Jayavarman II] and the brahmin Hiraṇyadāma made a solemn oath requiring the lineage of Śivakaivalya to officiate before the Kamrateṅ Jagat ta Rāja and forbidding any other persons to do so'. On women with cult responsibilities, sometimes called *kloṅ mratāṅ*, mentioned in pre-Angkorean inscriptions, see Vickery 1998, 163.

156. K. 136 A, v. 24: *śiṣṭāmvayācāraguṇā mṛte rājendravarmmaṇi sāpy abhyantaralekhinām adhipā jayavarmmaṇaḥ* 'Possessing the religious observances and virtues of her cultured lineage she became the chief of the private secretaries of Jayavarman after Rājendravarman's death'.

157. K. 134 of A.D. 781/2, v. 1 re Jayavarman (probably Jayavarman II): *śrījayavarmaṇi nṛpatau ... brahmakṣatrāṅśabhave*; K. 287 (undated) re Jayavarman VII: *dvijarājavaṃśyaḥ*; K. 528 of 952, v. 10, re Sarasvatī, wife of the brahmin Viśvarūpa, mother of Mahendradevī, the mother of Rājendravarman: *vrahmakṣatraparamparodayakarī*; C. 73a = M. 7, l. 3, re Rudravarman I (6th century), son of a brahmin (C. 96 = M. 12, v. 3: *dvijātapravarātmajaḥ*): *brahmakṣatriyakulatilake*; C. 25 = M. 23 of 799, v. 2 re Indravarman I: *brahmakṣatrapradhāno*.

158. This terminology is also found in Old Javanese; see Zoetmulder 1982, s.v. *sāmāṇyajana* and *catursāmāṇya* (*sic*). Similar is the distinction in Balinese society between the gentry (*triwangsa* [*triwaṃśa*]) comprising title-groups classified as brahmin, kṣatriya and vaiśya, and commoners comprising title-groups classified as śūdra, the latter comprising about ninety per cent of the population; see Hobart et al. 2001, 75–82; Geertz 1980, 26–27 and 148.

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

80 *tadarddhakan tu dāpyās te hemadaṇdātapatriṇaḥ*
tasyāpy arddhan tu mukhyānāṃ śreṣṭhināṃ vinayo mataḥ
81 *dāpyās tadarddhavinayaṃ śaivavaiṣṇavakādayaḥ*
tasyāpy arddhan tu vinayas sāmānyeṣu samīritaḥ
82 *dhanan dātum aśaktās syus sāmānyā yadi mānuṣāḥ*
pṛṣṭhe vetreṇa tān hanyāc chatam ity anuśāsanam
K. 323, v. 78–82

It is ruled that if out of arrogance brahmins should transgress this order they should be expelled from these precincts, since it is not fitting to chastise them with corporal punishments, and the like. Princes should be fined twenty Palas of gold. [Other] relatives of the king, and ministers, should be fined half that. [Other dignitaries] with golden-handled parasols should pay a fine of half that amount. Leading merchants should be fined half as much [2.5]. Śaiva and Vaiṣṇava and other [ascetics] should be fined half that. The fine for common people is set at half that. If a common person cannot pay his fine he should receive one hundred blows of the cane upon his back. [159]

The superficiality of the concept of caste among the Khmers is also evident in the fact that *varṇaḥ*, the Indian Sanskrit term for the [four] caste-classes from brahmin to Śūdra, was put to other use in Cambodian Sanskrit and Old Khmer. There it denotes title-groups or corporations associated with various kinds of royal service. A person could be honoured by enrolment into such a Varṇa, and new Varṇas could be created by royal decree. [160]

159. See also K. 279 C1, v. 10: *sāmānyamānavān sarvvān vālavṛddharujānvitān / dīnānāthāṃś ca yatnena bhared bhaktauṣadhādibhiḥ*; K. 904 B, l. 28: *ājñā vraḥ kaṃmratāṅ añ ta vrāhmaṇa tel nirvvāsya sāmānya śarīradaṇḍa.*

160. See, e.g., K. 157, v. 12: *koṃyākhyāṃ bhāgineyīṃ svāṃ nṛpatau tāṃ nivedya yaḥ / rājñopaskarageheṣu sevivarṇṇe pr atiṣṭhipat* 'who offered Kontī, the daughter of his sister, to the king and had him place her in the Varṇa of the servants in the houses of the utensils'; K. 205, v. 12: *tadguṇacoditamanasā narapatinā sādareṇa sa prathite / varṇṇe hemakaraṅke sakulapuro lekhito + +* 'persuaded by his virtues the king eagerly enrolled him with [all the members of his] family's settlement in the celebrated Gold Cup Varṇa'; K. 228, v. 17: *sa cā ∪ varṇṇottamatāṃ prapede* (CŒDÈS conjectures *cāravarṇṇottamatāṃ*) 'he become the leader of the ...Varṇa'; K. 278, v. 8: *śrīsūryyavarmmaṇo rājye varṇṇabhāge kṛte pi yaḥ / saṃpadaṃ prāpya sadbhakṭyā varṇṇaśreṣthatvasaṃsthitaḥ* 'who, when the Varṇas were distinguished during the reign of Sūryavarman, obtained wealth as the reward of his outstanding loyalty and became the leader of the Varṇa(s)'; K. 444 (ed. POU 2001, 130–138), A ll. 11–18: *man srā[c] vidhi mān vraḥ śāsana dhūli vraḥ pāda dhūli je[ṅ] vraḥ kamrateṅ añ ta kamrateṅ añ ta vraḥ guru pre res paṃnvās āy [ta neḥ] saptavarṇṇa [nu kule] nai ācāryyapradhāna pra[dvān] mok duk mūla khmuk vraḥ kralā arccana 20 mūla karmmāntara [20 o]y cralo phle sruk sre bhūmyākara leṅ [s]iddhi jā varṇṇa neḥ ta vyar* 'When the ritual had been completed there was an order from Our Lord the King to Our Lord the Venerable Guru instructing [him] to choose men in holy orders from the existing seven Varṇas and [from] the families of the Principal Ācāryas up till now in order to establish 20 Chiefs of Khmuks for the hall of worship and 20 Chiefs of Karmāntaras [and] to give them exclusive title to the revenues of these two Varṇas: villages, rice-fields and whatever wealth may be in the ground'; ibid. B, ll. 16–18: *vraḥ karuṇā [duk jā] varṇṇa [khmuk] vraḥ [kralā arccana] jā varṇṇa karmmāntara* 'The royal compassion established the Varṇa of the Khmuks of the hall of worship and that of the Karmāntaras'; K. 194, l. 8: *varṇa karmmāntara* (concerning Divākarapaṇḍita, the Guru of Jayavarman VI, Dharaṇīndravarman and Sūryavarman II and a member of this Varṇa); K. 534, v. 12cd: *prāpa paṃcāṃ varṇṇeṣv adhīśatām* 'he was appointed chief of the Varṇas of the guards'; K. 569 (ed. POU 2001, 166–171), l. 17: *qnak varṇṇa khnar grāṅ* 'the men of the title group of Khnar Grāṅ'; K. 717, v. 16: *rājādhirājo naganetrarandhre devīpurasthā janatās tadānīm / cakāra cāmīkarakāravarṇṇe nivedanāt tasya suśilpavuddhīn* 'Then as a result of the information received from him the Overlord of Kings enrolled the people then in Devīpura [knowing them to be] highly skilled in their art, in the Varṇa of the goldsmiths, in 927'; K. 989 B, ll. 8–9: *ta gi vraḥ rājya parameśvara gi nu res qji yeṅ ta*

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

The society of the Khmers also included persons called *khñuṃ* (pre-Angkorean *kñuṃ*) or *dāsa* (m.) / *dāsī* (f.) in the Khmer texts, and *dāsaḥ/dāsī* in the Sanskrit.[161] The Sanskrit terms mean slave (male/female); and though that term in the sense of an absolutely unfree and property-less person is not applicable to all categories among the Khmers' *khñuṃ*,[162] it is certainly applicable in general. For our inscriptions speak of their being bought, stating their purchase prices,[163] of their being donated together with their offspring to persons, or to temples as 'slaves of a god' (*khñuṃ vraḥ, devadāsa*),[164] along with land, livestock and other valuables, exchanged (K. 222), given to an officiant as payment for a sacrifice (*dakṣiṇā*) (K. 89, K. 523 D), and inherited as 'family slaves' (*khñuṃ santāna*) (K. 523 D). We also learn of a runaway slave who had been born in the sacred territory of a temple being recaptured and punished by having his nose and ears cut off (*karṇṇanāsikaccheda*) (K. 231). The same inscription tells us that he and his family were offered to the temple with full rights of ownership (*siddhi*). A pre-Angkorean inscription records the manumission of a female slave, her sons and grandsons by royal favour.[165]

---

jmah steñ rauv āy vrai svāy pramān śatagrāma varṇṇa qninditapura teṃ kāla jyak vraḥ travāṅ nagara śrīindrapura pi abhiṣeka saptavarṇṇa pi cek dau jā paṃcāṃ kanmyaṅ paṃre 'During his reign Parameśvara [Jayavarman II] chose [our] ancestor named Steñ Rauv, in Vrai Svāy of the Śatagrāma district, of the Varṇa of Aninditapura, when the excavation of the Sacred Pond of the capital Indrapura had been begun, in order to consecrate (*abhiṣeka*) the seven Varṇas, in order to divide them [and] make them Guards and Pages'; K. 92, v. 11: *so ninditapuraśreṣṭhavarṇasantānasantatiḥ*; K. 221B, ll. 7–8: *varṇa qnak pūrva* 'the Varṇa of the people of the East'; K. 254 B, ll. 2–3: *añ aṃcas varṣa chnāṃ tap pra[ṃ]piy gi nu gāl ta varṇa nā vrah canmāt* 'I, having reached the age of 18, served in the Varṇa of the Sacred Bulls'; K. 1036 (*NIC* II-III, 149–155), A l. 27: *varṇna smiṅ* 'the Varṇa of the officiants'.

161. They are distinguished from 'the common people' in K. 71 (mid-tenth century), ll. 7–8: *sāmānyajana nu khñuṃ vraḥ kamrateṅ añ* 'the common people and (*nu*) the slaves of the god'.

162. JACQUES 1976a, citing instances of (1) a *va* ('male slave') donating another to a god; see K. 54, I, l. 13 (*IC* 3:159): *aṃnoy va jleṅ ta vraḥ kamratāṅ añ va et* (= *NIC* II–III, 21, reading *va cat* rather than *va et*) 'Va Jleṅ donated Va Et/Cat to the god'; and (2) a *gho* purchasing a paddy-field for a price that included two slaves'. In the second case, however, the *gho* is described as a superintendent of temple personnel; see K. 958, North, ll. 21–25: *sre cāṃkā ti gho kumāra khloñ qnak khnet duñ ta vāp ṛṣi vāp dhap teṅ so teṅ vit vāp vrau paṃcāṃ dravya nu duñ khñuṃ vyar sru bhay vyar ti samakṣa nu vraḥ sabhā saṅ gol jvan ta vraḥ kaṃmrateṅ añ śrībhadreśvara qnau rudramahālaya* 'The paddy field [called] Cāṃkā that Gho Kumāra, superintendent (*khloñ*) of the personnel of the light fortnight, purchased from Vāp Ṛṣi, Vāp Dhap, Teṅ So, Teṅ Vit, Vāp Vrau *paṃcāṃ* for [the following] goods: two slaves (*khñuṃ*) and forty measures of rice, after the fixing of its boundaries had been witnessed by [representatives of] the Venerable Council (*vraḥ sabhā*), was donated to V.K.A. Śrī Bhadreśvara at Rudramahālaya'. See also VICKERY 1998, 225–250, 271–274.

163. See, e.g., K. 33 of A.D. 1017; K. 105 of A.D. 987; K. 493 of A.D. 657; K. 933 of A.D. 1013.

164. For the expression *khñuṃ vraḥ* see K. 254 B, l. 13 and K. 523 B, l. 27. For Khmer *devadāsa* see K. 415, l. 8. For Sanskrit *devadāsaḥ* see K. 717, v. 15.

165. K. 666, v. 2: *rājaprasādena hi somatistrī tasyāś [ca] p[u]trās tv atha pautrakāś ca / adāsabhāvaṃ prajagāma tasmai prabhāsasomā yamachidra*bāṇaiḥ* (corr. : *vānaiḥ* Ep.) 'By the favour of the king Prabhāsasomā, the wife of Somati, together with her children and grandchildren, ceased to be slaves, in [Śaka] 592.' The term *adāsabhāvaṃ prajagāma*, literally 'became 'non-slaves' (*adāsaḥ*) slaves, in [Śaka] 592.' The term *adāsabhāvaṃ prajagāma*, literally 'became 'non-slaves' (*adāsaḥ*) alludes to the formula of manumission "*adāsaḥ!*" as seen in *Nāradasmṛti* 5.40–41: *svadāsam icched yaḥ kartum adāsaṃ prītamānasaḥ / skandhād ādāya tasyāpi bhindyāt kumbhaṃ sahāmbhasā / akṣatābhiḥ sapuṣpābhir mūrdhany enam avākiret / adāsa iti coktvā triḥ prāṅmukhaṃ tam athotsṛjet* 'One who being delighted wishes to make his slave a non-slave should lift a pot full of water from that slave's shoulder and smash it. He should then scatter rice grains and flowers over his head, pronounce the [formula] "*adāsaḥ*" three times and then release him, turning away'. In the brahmanical Dharmaśāstra the only slaves that the king is said to have a duty to liberate are those who have been enslaved by force, having been kidnapped by criminals and sold (*Nāradasmṛti* 5.36: *caurāpahṛtavikrītā ye ca dāsīkṛtā balāt / rājñā mokṣayitavyās te dāsatvaṃ teṣu neṣyate*; *Kātyāyanasmṛti* 726).

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

Now, it might be thought that these persons formed a class in Khmer society so degraded that we could claim that while much of the detail of the Indian system of caste is lacking, the Khmers had at least its essential structure, namely the distinction between pure groups, of whom the purest were the brahmins, and a mass of persons excluded as pollutant. But this would be an error. There would be a *prima facie* reason to see the *khñuṃ* in this light, if it were the case that slaves in India were considered pollutant.[166] But I find no evidence that this was so and much that it was not.

For slaves working in Indian Śaiva temples we have the testimony of the *Śivadharmottara*, in which 'Śiva's slaves' (*śivadāsāḥ*) are distinguished from temple servants hired for wages in a passage that promises both categories of worker that they will attain the world of Rudra when they die:

ye cāpi vṛttibhṛtakāḥ śivāyatanakarmiṇaḥ
yānti te 'pi mṛtāḥ svarge śivakarmānubhāvataḥ
śivadāsatvam āpannā naranārīnapuṃsakāḥ
te 'pi tannāmasaṃyogād yānti rudrapuraṃ mahat
f. 12[75]v5–6 (2.166–167)

Those wage-earners who work in the temple of Śiva will also go to heaven when they die by virtue of their work for Śiva (*śivakarma*). As for men, women and the neuter who have become Śiva's slaves (Śivadāsas), they too, because of their connection with the name of that [god], will go to the great paradise of Rudra.[167]

The Śaiva Paddhati *Naimittikakarmānusandhāna* composed by Brahmaśambhu of the Karkaroṇī branch of the Mattamayūra lineage in 938/9 A.D. also distinguishes these two categories of worker. We are told that after the cremation of an ascetic of a hermitage (Maṭha) the Ācārya should announce the event to the initiated ascetics, lay Māheśvaras, slaves and workers [of the Maṭha]:

deśikādisamayyantān vyāhṛtya tu tapodhanān
māheśvarajanāṃś cāpi dāsān karmakarāṃs tathā
dṛṣṭapūrvāparān brūyād iti sarvvān sadharmmiṇaḥ.
ff. 92v5–93r1

Similarly, when an outgoing Ācārya passing on his duties to his successor tells him all the details of the foundation over which he will preside, these should include the slaves he must support:

105 *idaṃ sthānam iyaṃ vṛttir eṣā pustakasaṃhatiḥ*
amī vai bharaṇīyās tu dāsāḥ karmakarāś ca naḥ

166. This has been taken for granted by JACQUES 1976a, 73–74. He argues that those *khñuṃ* who were working within the temple, for example in the preparation of food, cannot have been slaves in the Indian sense, since this would have contravened brahmanical dietary taboos, and that this would surely have been unacceptable in Cambodia, even though the system was probably less rigid there.

167. The role of neuter slaves (*napuṃsakaḥ*, *klībaḥ*), that is to say, of men congenitally incapable of sexual intercourse and fatherhood rather than 'eunuchs', as these terms are commonly mistranslated, is unclear. I suppose that it was in the quarters reserved for the large numbers of women dedicated to the god as Rudragaṇikā dancers or in humbler capacities (Devadāsīs). The reference to connection with the name of the god mentioned in this passage shows that the term *śivadāsaḥ* is a title as well as a description. Cf. such terms as *śivagānavit* "a singer in a Śiva temple", *śivadīkṣitaḥ* "a Śaiva initiate", *śivabrāhmaṇaḥ* "a Śaiva brahman", *śivavratī* "a Śaiva ascetic", and *śivārāmaḥ* "the garden of a Śaiva temple or hermitage".

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

106 *etat sarvaṃ mayā tubhyaṃ dattam adya tvayāpi ca*
pālanīyaṃ tathā samyag yathāsmābhiḥ prapālitam
f. 73v1–3, = 4.105–106
105d *dāsāḥ* em. : *dāsya* Cod.

Such is the foundation; such is the revenue; such is the library; and these are the slaves and workers that it is my duty to support. All this I have given to you this day, and you should properly maintain it as I have done.[168]

The Śaiva scripture *Bṛhatkālottara* defines the property of a temple-god (*devasvam*) as whatever has been donated to that god, including humans (*dvipadāḥ*):

yad dattaṃ devadevāya tac caṇḍāya prakalpayet
lohaṃ bhū †vājayed yatnād† dvipadāś ca catuṣpadāḥ
maṇayo ratnanicayaṃ devasvaṃ parikīrtitam
f. 44v5–6, = 22.8c–10b

He should assign to [the charge of the deity] Caṇḍa whatever has been donated to Śiva. The property of a deity (*devasvam*) is defined as 'metals, lands, † ...†, human beings (*dvipadāḥ*), livestock, jewels and precious stones.[169]

and inscriptions confirm that such slaves were a common feature of temples.[170]

As for the relative purity or impurity of slaves in ancient India, it was a matter of their caste or that of their owner (*svāmī*), not of their degraded civil status. Thus when considering the proper duration of the periods of impurity (*āśaucakālaḥ*) for the various castes caused by the death or birth of a relative both brahmanical and Śaiva authorities rule that the period for a domestic slave should be that prescribed for his master, or if his master has died, that prescribed for his own caste, which would normally but not always be Śūdra.[171]

I see no reference to the period of impurity for temple slaves in brahmanical sources. But the Śaiva Trilocanaśiva rules that a female temple slave (*devadāsī*) and any Śūdra that works in the temple (which would include and is probably intended to mean male temple slaves of that caste) is subject to impurity for twenty days.[172] During this period they are not excluded

168. A related passage in the Keralan *Siddhāntasāra* of Īśānaśivagurudeva adds female slaves; see *Īśānaśivagurudevapaddhati. Kriyāpāda*. p. 196: *idaṃ sthānam ime dharmāś caite pustakasañcayāḥ · dāsīdāsādayaś caite paripālyā yathā purā.*

169. Cf. K. 81 A, v. 33ab: *dāsagokṣetrahemādi devadravyam aśeṣataḥ* 'the property of the god in its entirety comprising the slaves, cows, fields, gold etc.'

170. On evidence of male and female domestic slaves (*aḍiyār*) and 'slaves of the god' (*dēvaraḍiyār*) in South Indian inscriptions see APPADORAI 1990, 23–24, 256–258, 313–322; KARASHIMA 2001, 2: 124–129.

171. For this see *Bṛhaspatismṛti, Āśaucakāla*, v. 35: *svāmitulyena śaucena śuddhyante* 'they become pure after a period of purification equal to that of their owner'; Bhavadevabhaṭṭa, *Śavasūtakāśaucakāla-prakaraṇa*, p. 13: *dāsadāsīnāṃ tu na pṛthag āśaucam. kiṃ tu svāmiśaucakāla eva teṣāṃ śuddhiḥ. svāmyabhāve tv ātmīyam evāśaucam*; 'Male and female slaves do not have a period of impurity specific to them [as slaves]. On the contrary, their purification is in the period of time that is required for the purification of their owner. However, if their master has died, then the period of impurity is that which applies to them in their own right [as determined by their caste and any other relevant factors]': Trilocanaśiva, *Prāyaścittasamuccaya* p. 65: *bhṛtyānāṃ svāmijātyuktam anyeṣāṃ svoktam iṣyate* '[the period of impurity] for slaves is that prescribed for the caste of their owners. For others it is held to be that prescribed for their own [caste]'.

172. *Prāyaścittasamuccaya* p. 65: *dinair viṃśatibhiḥ śuddhir devadāsyāṃ prakīrtitā / tathā devālaye karmaratāḥ śūdrāḥ prakīrtitāḥ.*

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

from the temple but like anyone else in this state, regardless of their caste, may not come closer to the god than the outside of the entry hall that leads to the inner sanctum.[173]

Moroever, Trilocana follows Manu in prescribing thirty days for the purification of an ordinary Śūdra.[174] By prescribing only twenty days for Devadāsīs and Śūdra temple workers he conveys that they are of greater purity because of their connection with Śiva. For this is an adaptation of a ruling which has a similar sense in the brahmanical Dharmaśāstra. There we find that Śātātapa and Bṛhadvyāsa declare that Śūdras require only twenty days to be returned to full purity, and that this discrepancy is resolved by taking these authorities to mean this to apply only to devout, observant Śūdras, the rule of thirty days laid down by Manu applying to the rest.[175]

Moreover, just as not all Indian slaves were Śūdras, so the slaves of god in the Khmers' temples included some at least who are likely to have been of high birth. The evidence of this is in the names of the slaves listed in our inscriptions in records of donations. While nearly all the donors have Sanskrit names, the names of most of these slaves are Khmer, and some of them are derogatory.[176] Among the Sanskrit names too are some that are consonant with low status. For example, some male slaves mentioned in pre-Angkorean inscriptions were named after a day of the lunar month, probably because they were born or acquired on those days.[177] But we also find such names as Jyeṣṭhavarma, Īśānaśiva, Brahmaśiva, Mūrdhaśiva, Vaktraśiva, Varmaśiva, Śikhāśiva and Hṛdayaśiva.[178] The first of these is indicative of 'kṣatriya' status, names in - varma being held among the Khmers by royalty, generals and other high non-religious dignitaries. The rest are Śaiva initiation names (*dīkṣānāma*) and of a kind given only to brahmins according to most Indian authorities and to members of all castes above the Śūdras according to the rest,[179]

173. *Prāyaścittasamuccaya* p. 65, continuing: *āśaucināṃ tu sarveṣāṃ prāsādasya praveśanam / agramaṇḍapabāhye tu na doṣāya prakalpitam.*

174. *Prāyaścittasamuccaya* p. 61, = *Manusmṛti* 5.83d: *śūdro māsena śuddhyati* 'a Śūdra is pure after one month'.

175. See *Śavasūtakāśaucakālaprakaraṇa*, 12–13.

176. See VICKERY 1998, 247, citing as examples the names *vā cke* 'Dog'; *va kdit* 'Arse'; *svā kmau* 'Black Monkey'; *va sa-uy* 'Stinker'.

177. See, e.g., K. 66 (7th century): *vā caturthī*, *vā pañcamī*, *vā dvādaśī*; K. 140 of 676: *vā pañcamī*, *vā tray*... (probably *vā trayodaśī*), *vā daśamī* and *vā pūrṇṇamī*; K. 600 of 612: *va daśamī*; K. 560 (7th century): *vā ekādaśī*, *vā pañcamī*; K. 424 (7th century): *vā daśamī*; K. 562 (7th century).

178. K. 600: *va jyeṣṭhahvarmma*; K. 232: *gho īśānaśiva*; K. 232: *gho murddhnaśiva* (= Mūrdhaśiva); K. 824: *sī vaktraśiva*; K. 232: *gho varmmaśiva*; K. 232: *gho vrahmaśiva*; K. 420: *si śikhāśiva*; K. 420: *si hrdayaśiva*.

179. The view that initiation-names in -śiva (originally also -jyotis, -śikha and -sāvitra [the four Gocara names]) are the prerogative of brahmin males is taught in *Vidyāpurāṇa* cited by Rājānaka Takṣakavarta in *Nityādisaṃgrahapaddhati* f. 63v11, 64r12–13: *śivo jyotiḥ śikhā caiva sāvitraś ceti gocarāḥ ...yena ye dīkṣitās te pi tadgocarasamākhyayā / khyātās tv āśramadharmaś ca svecchāsaṅkalpato bhavet / etās saṃjñā dvijāgryāṇāṃ rājādīnāṃ gaṇāṅkitāḥ / śaktisaṃjñās tathā strīṇāṃ sarvāsāṃ parikīrtitāḥ* '-śiva, -jyotis, -śikha and -sāvitra are the lineage[-name]s. A person is given the lineage-name of his initiator. Duties according to stage of life are a matter of personal choice. These names are those of brahmins. The names of kings (kṣatriyas) and others are distinguished by [ending in] -gaṇa. It is ruled that all women should have names [ending in] -śakti'; *Mṛgendra*, *Kriyāpāda* 8.60c–61b: *srajaṃ vimocayen nāma dīkṣitānāṃ tadādikam / śivāntakaṃ dvijendrāṇām itareṣāṃ gaṇāntakam*: 'He should cast forward the flower. The names of initiates must begin with that [of the deity on to which it falls]. In the case of brahmins it should end in -śiva and for other [male initiates] in -gaṇa'; and *Bṛhatkālottara*, f. 91v3–4: *śivasaṃjñā dvijasyaiva kavacākhyā nṛpasya ca / vaiśyānāṃ devasaṃjñā ca śūdrāṇāṃ ca *gaṇāntakaṃ* (em. : *gaṇāntikaṃ* Cod.) 'Only the brahmin may have a name in -śiva. The king's name should be in -kavaca. Vaiśyas' names should end in -deva, and Śūdras' names in -gaṇa'. The minority view is seen in Kashmir: Bhaṭṭa Nārāyaṇakaṇṭha ad *Mṛgendra*,

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

names found elsewhere in our inscriptions as those of gentry and high-ranking religious dignitaries.[180]

That even persons of the highest rank could fall into slavery is apparent from K. 158 of the reign of Jayavīravarman (1002–*c.* 1010). This records that of three persons found guilty of misappropriating lands two were punished by the mutilation of their lips and the amputation of their hands and the third given to the litigant at his request along with his entire family and domain in what is surely a case of the punitive enslavement (*daṇḍa-dāsatvam*) recognized by brahmanical authorities.[181] The reason for the difference in

---

Kriyāpāda 8.60c–61, taking *dvijendrāḥ* 'the foremost of the twice-born' to refer implausibly to the best in all three caste-classes of the twice-born, i.e. outstanding brahmins, kṣatriyas or vaiśyas; *Tantrālokaviveka* ad 4.265ab; and Manodaguru, *Kalādīkṣāpaddhati*, BORI MS. 157 of 1886–92, ff. 96v16–97r: *tatpātāvasare śivanāmāṅkitaṃ śiṣyaṃ vidhāya striyaṃ ca śaktināmāṅkitāṃ vidhāya bhagavan sakaleśvara tvatpādapadmapūjanarasikamanāḥ ayam amukaśiva āgata iti puṃviṣaye. strīviṣaye tu bhagavan sakaleśvara tvatpādapadmapūjanarasikamanāḥ iyam amukadevī āgatā iti puṣpāñjalipātāvasare guruḥ kathayed ity arthaḥ. śūdraviṣaye tu ayam amukagaṇa āgata iti prayojyam. ayaṃ viṣayo bhuktiparaḥ. mumukṣau tu gurur evecchayā nāma kuryāt* '[The words] "When, at the time that it has fallen, the Guru has given a male candidate a name in - śiva and a female a name in -śakti" mean that as soon as the handful of flowers has fallen he should say in the case of a man "Lord Sakaleśvara [= Sakalasvacchanda], this [man] N-śiva has arrived, eager to worship the lotuses that are your feet" and in the case of a woman "Lord Sakaleśvara, this [woman] N-devī has arrived, eager to worship the lotuses that are your feet." But in the case of a Śūdra [male] he should use "this [man] N-gaṇa has arrived". This matter concerns [the attainment of] rewards. As for one who seeks liberation, the Guru may give him any name he pleases'.

180. K. 352, N ll. 18-19: Loñ Astraśiva; K. 343: Vāp Īśānaśiva; K. 950: Ācārya Caitanyaśiva, Sabhādhipati; K. 373: Loñ Vrahmaśiva; K. 723: Vaktraśiva; K. 1050 (POU 2001, 99): Mrateñ Vaktraśiva; K. 265 A: Steñ Varmaśiva, Khloñ Vnaṃ (Skt. *śailādhipaḥ*) of the royal Indreśvara temple; K. 220: Vāp Varmaśiva (Karmmāntara of Thkvāl Loṅ) and Steñ Varmaśiva the younger; K. 933: a hermitage founded at Hariharālaya in 978 A.D. by Loñ Varmaśiva, grandson in the maternal line of Nandikācārya, the Ācāryapradhāna and Vraḥ Guru of Indravarman (r. 877–889 A.D.); K. 235: Vāmaśiva, Guru of Yaśovarman, priest of the Devarāja; K. 253: Śikhāśiva, Hotar of Yaśovarman; K. 834: Śikhāśiva, Purohita of Jayavarman V; K. 1074 / K. 1090: Mratāñ Śikhāśiva; K. 1152 (POU 2001, 126–128): land given to Vāp Sarvaśiva and transferred to Mrateñ Somaśiva, his nephew; Ban That inscription, *BEFEO* XII, 2 ff.: Mūrdhaśiva (= Bhūpendrapaṇḍita I), Sabhāpati of Jayavarman VI (1080–*c.* 1107), Dharaṇīndravarman I (1107–1113) and Sūryavarman II (1113–*c.* 1150). The giving of names in -varma to kṣatriyas follows *Manusmṛti* 2.32b. If these slaves with names in -śiva were brahmins then this was in contravention of the rule of *Kāṭyāyanasmṛti* 715cd: *triṣu varṇeṣu vijñeyaṃ dāsyaṃ viprasya na kvacit* 'Know that the three caste-classes [kṣatriya, vaiśya and śūdra] may be slaves, but never a brahmin'; ibid. 717: *samavarṇo 'pi vipraṃ tu dāsatvaṃ naiva kārayet / brāhmaṇasya hi dāsatvān nṛpatejo vihanyate* 'Even a person of the same caste-class may not make a brahmin his slave. For the enslavement of a brahmin destroys the king's power'.

181. See *Manusmṛti* 8.415cd, in which the *daṇḍadāsaḥ* 'the slave by punishment' is listed as the last of seven types of legally permitted slave. Judicial enslavement is also recognized in the Śaiva context. The *Śivadharmottara* reports that free women could be forced as punishment for unspecified offences to become Rudragaṇikās (also called Rudrakanyās or Rudranārīs), female temple slaves of a superior class whose duty was to gratify the deity with dancing (f. 12[75]v7–8, = 12.168): *dattāḥ krītāḥ praviṣṭāś ca *daṇḍotpannā* (em. : *daṇḍātpannāḥ* Cod.) *balāhṛtāḥ / vijñeyā rudragaṇikāḥ śivāyatanayoṣitaḥ* 'Know that Rudragaṇikās, the women of the temple of Śiva, are [of five kinds:] those given, those purchased, those who have entered [of their own free will], those who have become [Rudragaṇikās] as a punishment [for a crime] (*daṇḍotpannāḥ*), and those acquired by force'. They are superior to other persons who are the god's property because Trilocanaśiva gives the rule that the period of impurity caused by the death or birth of a relative is only fifteen days in their case, whereas he gives it as twenty days for a Devadāsī; see *Prāyaścittasamuccaya* p. 65: *ye ca māheśvarāḥ śūdrā bhasmarudrākṣadhāriṇaḥ / teṣāṃ pañcadaśāhena śuddhiḥ sūtau mṛtāv api / tathaiva *rudrakanyāyāṃ* (em. : *śūdrakanyāyāṃ* Cod.) *pañcācārye 'pi *saṃmatam* (em. : *saṃmatau* Cod.) 'Śūdras who are devotees of Śiva and wear ashes and Rudrākṣa seeds are purified in fifteen days if there is a

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

treatment seems to be that the third culprit was the brother of the litigant's mother. This means that he was the son of Vīrendravīra, the general of king Harṣavarman II.[182]

Indian slaves, then, were not impure by reason of their civil status and there is no evidence that Khmer slaves, domestic or belonging to deities, were considered more impure than their Indian counterparts. The Chinese Zhou Daguan, observing the Khmers at the end of the thirteenth century, reported that their numerous domestic slaves were made to sit and sleep beneath the raised floors of the Khmers' houses, and that any visiting Chinese who had sexual intercourse with a slave girl even once was shunned by her Khmer master. But he also reports that slaves were allowed to enter the house, as in India, to carry out domestic duties.[183] This is far from untouchability in the brahmanical sense, and there is no sign of a more degraded group in Khmer society. For an Indian untouchable (*caṇḍālaḥ*) was required by the brahmanical tradition to live with others of his caste far outside the limits of the settlement (*grāmaḥ*) of the four caste-classes. He might enter it only in the forenoon to remove ordure and to perform any executions that may be required; he was to be executed himself if he were found within the settlement after midday; and he was ruled to be without right of access to the benefits of religion (*sarvadharmabahiṣkṛtaḥ*, *sarvakarmabahiṣkāryaḥ*).[184]

Premodern Indian sources reveal no knowledge even of the existence of the Khmers. But how, one wonders, would Indian brahmanical authorities have looked upon this region? Would they have recognized it as part of the territory of their religion, that is to say, as a land fit for the performance of its sacrifices (*yajñiyo deśaḥ*)?

The answer must be no, if one applies the standard of the authoritative brahmanical jurist Medhātithi, writing in the ninth or tenth century,[185] since he rules the following in his commentary on *Manusmṛti* 2.23:

> *yadi kathaṃcid brahmāvartādideśam api mlecchā ākrameyuḥ tatraivāvasthānaṃ kuryur bhaved evāsau mlecchadeśaḥ. tathā yadi kaścit kṣatriyādijātīyo rājā sādhvācaraṇo mlecchān parājayet cāturvarṇyaṃ vāsayet mlecchāṃś cāryāvarta iva cāṇḍālān vyavasthāpayet so 'pi syād yajñiyaḥ*
>
> If somehow foreigners (*mlecchāḥ*) were to invade a region such as Brahmāvarta and establish themselves there it would certainly become foreign [and so unfit for brahmanical sacrifices]. Equally if some king of orthodox observance belonging to the

---

birth or death. The same is accepted for the Rudrakanyā and the [musicians and dancing-instructor known as] the Five Ācāryas'. Evidently this rule applies to them on the assumption that they are Śūdras, that is to say, as a further reduction of the thirty days ruled for castes so classified.

182. K. 158, 25–26: *oṣṭhacchedaṃ karacchedaṃ heṃnāmnaḥ pvāhvāyasya ca / yathā taddoṣataḥ kuryād iti tadrājaśāsanam / svamātāmahasūnus tu kenāmā sakulas tadā / yācitas sahadevena rājñā dattas sabhūmikaḥ* 'That king commanded that because of their crime Heṃ and Pū should have their lips mutilated and their hands amputated. But at Sahadeva's request, Ke, [being] the son of the father of his mother, was given to him along with his family and lands'. That the father of his mother was Vīrendravīra and the general of Harṣavarman (II) is stated in K. 158, v. 11.

183. PELLIOT 1951, 19. Zhou Daguan gives the going rate for a slave as one hundred lengths of cloth for one that is young and strong, and about thirty or forty for one that is old and weak. This corresponds quite well with the prices indicated in our inscriptions. For example, K. 933 of A.D. 1013 records the purchase of a woman and four children for sixty garments, of a woman for one buffalo, of a woman for twenty measures of paddy, of a woman for one frying-pan weighing six *jyaṅ*, and of a man for ten *yo* of garments and twenty measures of paddy. These reports reveal, incidentally, that the Khmers' economy was not monetarized.

184. See *Manusmṛti* 10.12b, 10.51–56; *Vaikhānasadharmasūtra* 144.3–8.

185. DERRETT 1975, 6. KANE, 1930–1962, vol. 1, section 63, 275, = 1/i (2nd ed.), 583, places him between 800 and 900 A.D.

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

kṣatriya or other [appropriate] caste were to conquer the foreigners [of some country], settle a community of the four caste-classes [there], and reduce the foreigners to the status of untouchables (*caṇḍālāḥ*), as in Āryāvarta, then that too would become fit for brahmanical sacrifice.[186]

As we have seen, there is no evidence that any part of the indigenous Khmer population was reduced to untouchability, let alone the whole of it, as Medhātithi requires.[187] But the absence of a fully formed caste system is unlikely to have been problematic for many, since the fundamental distinction, that between brahmins and their patrons was present. This may have been all the more so for the Śaivas, since their religion was essentially that of a brahmin-kṣatriya culture centred on the court, the royal temple and the hermitage. As for the other non-brahmanical aspects of Khmer society there are large parts of India itself in which traditions such as matrilineal succession and cross-cousin marriage have survived within otherwise fully brahmanical communities,[188] traditions that were so integral to those communities that the theorists of Brahmanism conceded them as *deśadharmaḥ*, as institutions prescribed and therefore meritorious for persons within the regions (*deśa-*) in which they are practised.[189] So those who had reason to do so could have accommodated Khmer traditions of inheritance and property in the same way.

In any case we have clear evidence in the Khmers' inscriptions that there were Indian brahmins prepared to migrate to the region and to accept the daughters of Khmer royalty in marriage. Durgasvāmin, a Taittirīya brahmin, is said to have been born in the Deccan (Dakṣiṇāpatha) and to have married the daughter of Īśānavarman I (r. 616/7, 627–*c.* 635) (K. 438). Another Taittirīya, the Śaiva Śakrasvāmin, is said to have been born in Madhyadeśa (K. 904) and to have married a daughter of Jayavarman I (r. 657, –690+). K. 95, v. 5 (= K. 323, v. 6) tells us that a brahmin Agastya of Āryadeśa, expert in the Veda and its ancillary sciences, married the princess Yaśomatī, the great-great-grandmother of the wife of Indravarman I (r. 877–before 889); and K. 263, v. 30 reports that the brahmin Divākarabhaṭṭa, husband of the younger sister of Rājendravarman (r. 944–968), had been born where Kṛṣṇa sported beside the river Yamunā, which is to say in the region of Mathurā in northern India. K. 910 of A.D. 651 mentions the benefactions of a brahmin Anantasvāmin from Mālava in western India; and K. 923, v. 14 describes Śrīnivāsakavi, who served as a royal priest under Indravarman and his predecessor Jayavarman III (r. *c.* 835–before 877), as supremely learned in the Veda and as an immigrant who came from the excellent land of his birth to purify that of the Khmers.[190] It is very probable that this 'excellent land' was some region of the Indian subcontinent. Finally, K. 300, v. 7–10

186. For Medhātithi the relevant criteria in the present case must have been that the barbarians should be made to live apart as untouchables outside the religion. Only then could a conquered and colonized territory be fit for Brahmanical rites.

187. The same was and is the case among the Balinese of Bali and Lombok. They classify society within the four brahmanical caste-classes (*caturwangsa*): *brahmana*, *satria*, *wesia* (*triwangsa* [gentry]) and *sudra* (commoners); and they recognize no untouchable group outside them. On the Balinese caste-system see HOBART *et al.* 2001, 76–82.

188. Matriliny is practised by the Nayars of Kerala (see FULLER 1976; GOUGH 1993) and there is cross-cousin marriage (marriage between the children of a brother and sister) throughout the communities in which Dravidian languages are spoken (see TRAUTMANN 1993a and 1993b).

189. See TRAUTMANN 1993a, 87–88. There he renders *deśadharmaḥ* as 'regional custom'. But as *dharmaḥ* it is more than custom. It is religiously valid activity that generates merit, but only, in this case, for those in the region in which the custom is established.

190. K. 923, v. 14: *yaḥ praśaste svadeśe pi saṃbhūtò vedavittamaḥ / praśasyakamvudeśānāṃ pāvanārtham ihāgataḥ.*

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

reports the tradition that the preceptorial lineage of the fourteenth-century Śaivācārya and royal Guru Vidyeśa descended from an Indian Sarvajñamuni, who was believed to have transported himself to the land of the Khmers by means of Yoga in order to worship the pre-eminent Śiva of this region.[191]

Moreover, there is Chinese testimony that there were Indian brahmins elsewhere in mainland Southeast Asia. The *Wenxian tongkao*, Ma Duanlin's encyclopaedic history of institutions published in A.D. 1317, draws on an early Chinese report that Indian brahmins had been greatly favoured by the king of the nearby kingdom of Panpan on the Malay peninsula and that many had come to his court to profit from his patronage;[192] and a source of the fifth century cited in the *Taiping yulan*, the general encyclopedia (*leishu*) published by Li Fang and others in A.D. 984, reports that there were more than a thousand Indian brahmins in Dunsun, a principality in the same area and a dependency of the early kingdom of southern Kambujadeśa that the Chinese called Funan. The people of Dunsun, we are told, followed the religion of these brahmins, many of whom had settled there permanently since they had been given local women as wives.[193]

The Pre-eminence of Śaivism

Of the three Indian faiths of the Khmers Śaivism appears to have been the most widespread and the most deeply rooted. Already in the sixth century a Chinese source, the *Nan Qishu*, the Standard History of the Southern Qi dynasty (A.D. 479–501), cites the report of an Indian Buddhist monk Nāgasena sent by the king of Funan to the Chinese court in 484 that though Buddhism was present in the region the dominant religion was the worship of Maheśvara (= Śiva).[194] In later times it was so central to the ceremonial life of the monarchy that it may be called the state religion. Śaiva temples and associated hermitages far outnumber others in the epigraphic and material records; and it was Śaiva ascetics that were the pre-eminent preceptors and priests of the élite. The pyramid-based state-temples built by the major Khmer rulers of the Angkorean period at the centre of the ceremonial capitals (*puram*) whose foundation marked their reigns were mostly temples of Śivas incorporating the ruler's name installed by Śaiva officiants;[195] and during this same period Śaiva initiation (*dīkṣā*) became a regular addition to the conventional brahmanical rite of royal consecration (*rājyābhiṣekaḥ*), being received even when a king's personal religious loyalty (*bhaktiḥ*) was to Viṣṇu or the Buddha rather than to Śiva.[196] For their services these officiants were rewarded with lands, slaves, and other valuables, and they were granted the golden palanquins (*dolā*, *dolāyānam*, *śibikā*), golden-handled fly-whisks (*cāmaram*), fans (*vyajanam*), white parasols (*sitātapatram*), peacock feather parasols

191. It is possible, though not probable, that the Madhyadeśa and Dakṣiṇāpatha mentioned in the first two of these cases were Khmer localities named after those in India; for these see K. 300, v. 22, Ka. 18 (Madhyadeśa) and K. 289 B, v. 10 (Dakṣiṇāpatha) : and cf. VICKERY 1998, 124, 194, 205.

192. See CŒDÈS 1968, 52.

193. PELLIOT 1903, 279.

194. The relevant passage of this work, composed by Xiao Zixian (A.D. 489–537), has been translated in PELLIOT 1903, 260.

195. For the Indian practice of establishing a deity under the name N-īśvara, N-īśvarī etc. where N is the name of the founder (*yajamānaḥ*) or a person designated by him, commonly a parent, see below, p. 415 and n. 250. It does not imply any degree of apotheosis.

196. These matters of the Śaiva state-temples and royal Śaiva initiation will be taken up in the sequel of this study.

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

(*māyūrātapatram*), and other regal insignia that marked elevation to the ranks of the highest dignitaries of the state;[197] and they were not infrequently related to the royal families by marriage.

The Śaivization of the land

Furthermore, neither Pāñcarātrika Vaiṣṇavism nor Mahāyāna Buddhism became so intimately connected with the land itself. In the pre-Angkorean period most of the Śivas whose installation in Liṅgas is recorded in our inscriptions, at least two thirds, were given the names of the Śivas of venerable Śaiva sites of pilgrimage in India. They have a name in -īśvara preceded by the name of one of those sites, meaning, therefore, 'the Śiva of X', or the name (in -īśvara) of the deity that presides there. The effect of the practice is to transfigure the Khmer realm by creating a Śaiva landscape whose sacred enclaves could be seen as doubles of those of the religion's Indian homeland.

Nineteen such names, some given to more than one Khmer Śiva, are those of Indian Śivas of such fame and sanctity that they are included in the following four lists in Indian sources:

1. The "five Liṅgas" of v. 50 of the *Śivastuti* of Halāyudha in an inscription of A.D. 1063 on the Ardhamaṇḍapa of the Amareśvara temple at Māndhātā (A).[198]
2. The forty Śiva sites, in five sets of eight, taught in the *Śivadharma*[199] and

197. K. 156: the ascetic Kambu, the king's emissary: K. 194, ll. 13–33: Divākarapaṇḍita, the Rājaguru [Vraḥ Guru] of Jayavarman VI (r. 1080–1107), Dharaṇīndravarman I (1107–1113) and Sūryavarman II (r. 1113–*c.* 1150); K. 218, v. 23, reign of Sūryavarman I (1002–1050): Mādhava, father of Deva-Vāgīśvarapaṇḍita; K. 235, vv. 75–76: Deva-Jayendrapaṇḍita (formerly Sadāśiva as a religious), purohita of the Devarāja under Sūryavarman I (r. 1002–*c.* 1050); K. 235, vv. 97–117: *dakṣiṇā* to the same after the *dīkṣā* of Udayādityavarman II (r. 1050–1066); K. 381, v. 2: Deva-Tapasvīndrapaṇḍita, from Sūryavarman I; K. 532, v. 39: the Śaivācārya Hṛṣīkeśa, from Rājendravarman (r. 944–968); K. 706 A v. 8: an unnamed Rājaguru; K. 834, v. 94: Śivācārya, Purohita of Jayavarman V (r. 968–1000), Hotar of Sūryavarman I; K. 842, v. 18: Ācārya Yajñavarāha, Guru of Jayavarman V; K. 842, v. 31: Ācārya Viṣṇukumāra, younger brother of Yajñavarāha; K. 692, v. 53: Bhūpendrapaṇḍita II, Sausnātika of Sūryavarman II.

These royal insignia are pan-Indic. Indian sources for the chowry (*cāmaraḥ*) and the parasol (*chattram, ātapatram*) and their distinctions according to the status of those for whom they are carried are Varāhamihira, *Bṛhatsaṃhitā*. Adhyāyas 71–72 and *Viṣṇudharmottara Khaṇḍa* 2, chs. 12–13. For the giving of a palanquin and other royal insignia (*rājāṅgāni*) to the Śaiva officiant at the time of his consecration to office (*ācāryābhiṣekaḥ*) see *Svacchanda* 4.470; → Bhojarāja, *Siddhāntasārapaddhati* A, f. 41v2: *uṣṇīṣamakuṭacchatrapādukācāmarahastyaśvaśibikādirājāṅgāni*; → *Somaśambhupaddhati* 3:483 (*Ācāryābhiṣekavidhi* v. 17abc). Cf. the list of the king's insignia (*rājacihnāni*) to be empowered before battle in *Liṅgapurāṇa*, *Uttarabhāga* 27.259c–260b: his white parasol, conch, chowry, 'drum etc.' (*bheryādyam*), palanquin (*śibikā*) and war banner (*vaijayantī*).

198. *EI* 25, 185: *avimuktaś ca kedāra oṃkāraś cāmaras tathā / paṃcamaṃ tu mahākālaḥ pañca liṅgāḥ *prakīrttitāḥ* (em. Ed.: *prakīrttaye* Ep.) 'Avimukt[eśvar]a, Kedār[eśvar]a, Oṃkār[eśvar]a, Amar[eśvar]a and, fifth, Mahākāla, are called the Five Liṅgas'.

199. *Śivadharma* (H), A, f. 40v6–41r5; B, f. 37v3–38r1 (12.110c–122b): *bhastrāpadaṃ rudrakoṭir avimuktaṃ mahālayam* / 111 *gokarṇṇaṃ bhadrakarṇṇañ ca suvarṇākṣo 'tha dīptimān / sthāṇvīśvaraś ca vikhyātas triṣu lokeṣu viśrutaḥ* / 112 *sthānāṣṭakam idaṃ jñeyaṃ rudrakṣetraṃ mahodayam / bhastrāpadādi sthāṇvantaṃ rudrasāyujyakāraṇam* / 113 *chagalaṇḍo duraṇḍaś ca mākoṭaṃ maṇḍaleśvaram / kālañjaraṃ śaṅkukarṇṇaṃ *sthūleśvaraḥ sthaleśvaraḥ* (B: *sthaleśvaraḥ sthūleśvaraḥ* A) 114 *pavitrāṣṭakam ity etat mahāpuṇyābhivarddhanam / mṛtāḥ prayānti tatraiva śivasya paramaṃ padam* / 115 *gayā caiva kurukṣetraṃ nakhalaṅ kanakhalan tathā / vimaleśvaroṭṭahāsam mahendram bhīmam *aṣṭamam* (conj. *aṣṭakam* AB) / 116 *etad guhyāṣṭakan nāma sarvvapāpavimocanam / gatvā tu puruṣaḥ śrīmān prāpnoti śivamandiram* / 117

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

throughout the literature of the Śaiva Mantramārga, where they are listed in accounts of the hierarchy of worlds (*bhuvanādhvā*) in the five ascending reality-levels of Water, Fire, Wind, Ether and the I-maker (*ahaṅkāraḥ*), as paradises to which the uninitiated laity who die in the eponymous sites are translated.[200]

śrīparvvataṃ hariścandraṅ jalpam amrātikeśvaram / madhyamaṅ ca mahākālaṃ kedāram bhairavan tathā / 118 *etad guhyātiguhyaṅ ca aṣṭakaṃ parikīrttitam / santārya tu pitṝn sarvvān śivaṃ *yānti* (B : *śānti* A) *paraṃ padam /* 119 *amreśvaram prabhāsaṅ ca naimiṣam puṣkaran tathā / āṣāḍhi diṇḍimuṇḍiś ca bhārabhūtim bhavāntakam /* 120 *nakulīśvaro tha vikhyātas tathā pratyātmiko mahān / pratyātmikāṣṭakaṅ kṣetraṃ rudrasya hitakāmikam /* 121 *tatra yānti mṛtās sarve rudrasya paramaṃ padam / dānāny āvasathaṃ kūpam udyānan devatālayam /* 122 *tīrtheṣv etāni yaḥ kuryāt so 'kṣayaṃ phalam āpnuyāt*. The reading *amreśvaraṃ* in 119a is for the sake of the metre, standing for *amareśvaram*.

200. See, e.g, *Niśvāsaguhya* f. 64r5–v3 (A): *pratyātmikāṣṭakād ūrdhvaṃ guhyāṣṭakam ataḥ paraṃ / atigu[hyā]ṣṭakaṃ caiva pavitrāṣṭakam eva ca / *sthāṇvaṣṭakaṃ* (em. : *sthānāṣṭakam* Cod.) *ca pañcaite pravakṣyāmy anupūrvaśaḥ / amareśam *prabhāsaṃ* (em. : *prahāsaṃ* Cod.) *ca naimiṣaṃ puṣkaraṃ tathā / āṣāḍhir diṇḍimuṇḍiṃ ca bhārabhūtiṃ *salākulim* (em. : *samākulim* Cod.) / **pratyātmike* (em. : *pratyātmikā* Cod.) *mṛtā ye tu te vrajanty eva tat padam / hariścandraṃ puraṃ guhyaṃ guhyaṃ madhyamakeśvaram / śrīparvataṃ samākhyātaṃ jalpeśvaram ataḥ paraṃ / ambratike[śvaraṃ] caiva mahākālaṃ tathaiva ca / kedāram uttamaṃ guhyaṃ mahābhairavam eva ca / guhyāṣṭake mṛtā ye tu te vrajantīha tat padam / gayā caiva kurukṣetraṃ nakhalaṃ kanakhalaṃ tathā / vimalaṃ cāṭṭahāsaś ca māhendram bhīmam aṣṭamam / *atiguhye* (em. : *atiguhya* Cod.) *mṛtā ye tu atiguhyaṃ vrajanti te / *bhastrāpadaṃ* (em. : *bhadrāpadam* Cod.) *rudrakoṭim avimukta *mahālayam* (em. : *mahābalam* Cod.) / *gokarṇa bhadrakarṇaś ca svarṇ[ākṣaḥ sthāṇu]r aṣṭamam / eteṣv api mṛtāḥ samyag bhittvā lokam aśeṣataḥ / dīpyamānās tu gacchanti atra sthāneṣu ye mṛtā / chagaraṇḍaṃ dviraṇḍaṃ ca mākoṭam maṇḍaleśvaram / kālañjaraṃ samākhyātaṃ devadāruvanaṃ tathā / śaṅkukarṇan tathaiveha sthaleśvaram ataḥ paraṃ / eteṣv api mṛtā ye tu bhittvā lokam aśeṣataḥ / dīpyamānās tu gacchanti sthāṇva[aṣṭaka]m idam priye*; *Svāyambhuvasūtrasaṃgraha* 4.45–54 (B): *Mataṅga. Vidyāpāda* 18.109–112, 19.34–38, 20.51c–55, 21.17–19; 22.13–15 (C); *Sarvajñānottara*, *Adhvaprakaraṇa* 62–85b (B, pp. 62–4) (D), giving the names of the presiding Śivas rather than the sites themselves: 62 *eṣām ūrdhvaṃ bhaved āpo daśadhāvṛtya saṃsthitāḥ / †kharāravamukharan† āvartormi*samākulāḥ* (corr. : *samākulaḥ* Cod.) / 63 *tatrāste bhagavān devo varuṇo mṛtasaṃbhavaḥ / śuddhasphaṭika*saṃkāśa* (corr. : *saṃkāśī* Cod.) *ādiguhyāṣṭakāvṛtaḥ /* 64 *oṃkāras tasya pūrveṇa āgneyyāṃ śaśibhūṣaṇaḥ / devadevas tu yāmyāyā*m ajāgandhis* (em. : *ṃ bhojagandhas* Cod.) *tu nairṛte /* 65 **āṣāḍhiś caiva* (em. : *āṣāḍhameś ca* Cod.) **vāruṇyāṃ* (corr. : *vāruṇyāḥ* Cod.) *vāyavyāṃ diṇḍir eva ca / *bhārabhūtis* (corr. : *bhārabhūmis* Cod.) *tu saumyāyām aiśānyāṃ lākuḷaṃ viduḥ /* 66 *ata ūrdhvaṃ bhaved anyad *āgneyāvaraṇaṃ* (conj. : *āgneryāvaraṇaṃ* Cod.) *viduḥ / *sudhmātāyasasaṃkāśo* (em. : *sudmātāyasusaṃkāśa* Cod.) *megha-stanitanisvanaḥ /* 67 *tatrāste bhagavān agnir *atiguhyāṣṭakāvṛtaḥ* (em. : *iti mahyāṣṭakā pratiḥ* Cod.) / *padmarāgapratīkāśo jvalantas tena tejasā /* 68 *haraś ca tripuraghnaś ca *triśūlī* (corr. : *triśūliḥ* Cod.) *sūkṣma eva ca / mahākāḷaś ca *śarvaś* (corr. : *sarvāś* Cod.) *ca īśāno *bhairavas* (corr. : *bharavas* Cod.) *tathā /* 69 *ata ūrdhvaṃ bhaved anyad vāyavyāvaraṇaṃ punaḥ / nīlajīmūtasaṃkāśo bhinnāñjana-samaprabhaḥ /* 70 *tatrāste bhagavān vāyuḥ *kṛṣṇavarṇo 'ñjanopamaḥ* (corr. : *kṛṣṇavarṇāñjanopamaḥ* Cod.) / *subhagaḥ kāmarūpī ca guhyādguhyāṣṭakāvṛtaḥ /* 71 **pitāmahapituḥ* (corr. : *pitāmahaṃ pituḥ* Cod.) *sthānaṃ svayambhūr ugra eva ca / viśveśaś ca *mahānādo* (em. : *mahābādo* Cod.) *mahad bhīmas tathāṣṭamaḥ /* 72 *ataś cordhvaṃ bhaved vyoma bhūta†stve† *saṃpratiṣṭhitaḥ* (conj. : *pradaṣitaḥ* Cod.) / *aprameyam anirdeśyaṃ mokṣasthānam *ivāparam* (corr. : *ivāparaḥ* Cod.) / 73 *tatrāste bhagavān devo vyomarūpī maheśvaraḥ / sūkṣma*mūrtir* (corr. : *mūrti* Cod.) **mahāṃś* (corr. : *mahāś* Cod.) *cāsau pavitrair aṣṭabhir *vṛtaḥ* (corr. : *vitaḥ* Cod.) / 74 **bhavaś* (corr. : *bhāvaś* Cod.) *caiva mahāyogī trimūrtī rudra eva ca / mahābalaśivaś caiva sahasrākṣaḥ sthāṇur eva ca /* 75 *ato hy ūrdhvaṃ bhavet *tattvam ahaṃkārasya* (corr. : *tattvaṃhaṃkārasya* Cod.) *ṣaṇmukha / dīptapāvakavarṇābhaṃ bhīmanādaṃ durāsadam /* 76 *trividhas *sa ca* (conj. : *tastya* Cod.) *vijñeyo haṃkāro ghorarūpadhṛk / *pralayāmbudanirghoṣaḥ* (corr. : *pralayāmbudhanirghoṣa* Cod.) *sthāṇvaṣṭakasamāvṛtaḥ /* 77 *kaparda ūrdhva*retāś ca* (em. : *rebhāś ca* Cod.) *mahān utkaṭa eva ca / śrīkaṇṭho nīlakaṇṭhaś ca mahātejās tathaiva ca /* 78 **mahāliṅgaś* (em. : *mahāliṅgiś* Cod.) *ca sthūleśaḥ kāraṇājñānuvartinaḥ / ādiguhyāṣṭakā rudrā atiguhyāṣṭakās tathā /* 79 *guhyādguhyāṣṭakāś caiva pavitrāṣṭaka eva ca / sthāṇvaṣṭakāś ca *pañcaite* (em. : *paścaite* Cod.) *yogād *bhūmivāsinaḥ* (em. : *bhūmivāsinaḥ* Cod.) / 80 *anugrahāya *lokānāṃ* (em. : *mokānāṃ* Cod.) *liṅgabhūtāḥ *pratiṣṭhitaḥ* (em. :

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

Since this set of forty sites is found both in the *Śivadharma* and throughout the scriptural authorities of the Mantramārga, and since there is nothing specifically Mantramārgic about the list itself—indeed the first eight are clearly Pāśupata[201]—it is probable that it was already current when the first scriptures of the Mantramārga came

---

pradaṣṭitāḥ Cod.) / *teṣām eva samīpa*sthaṃ* (corr. : *sthaḥ* Cod.) *yad yat toyaṃ ṣaḍānana* / 81 *tat tīrthaṃ *paramaṃ* (em. : *punaraṃ* Cod.) *puṇyaṃ tatra snātvā śivaṃ vrajet*; *Kiraṇa* VP 8.108c–118c (E); *Svacchanda* 10.853–854, 871–873b, 883–884, 886c–890b (F); *Mālinīvijayottara* 5.15c–22b (G). The five sets are also mentioned in the *Rauravasūtrasaṃgraha* (4.12cd: *pañcāṣṭakaṃ caiva pratyātmakam athāditaḥ / guhyaṃ tathātiguhyaṃ ca pavitraṃ sthāṇusaṃjñitam*) and the *Pauṣkarapārameśvara/Pārameśvara* (as quoted by Bhaṭṭa Nārāyaṇakaṇṭha ad *Mṛgendra*, *Kriyāpāda* 8.78–79: *uktaṃ hi śrīmatpauṣkare: kālāgnirudrāt prabhṛti kramāt pañcāṣṭakāvadhi / laukikānugrahaḥ kāryaḥ*), though the forty sites are not listed in what we have of either. In most of these sources only the site is named, but in the *Sarvajñānottara* and, in a few instances, in the *Mataṅga* the names of the Śivas of the sites are given, though in some cases the name given is simply that of the site followed by -īśa/īśvara. In some of these cases it appears that the deity may be referred to either in that way or under his proper name. In other cases the presiding deity is identified only in the first style. This is the case with Lākula/Lākulin/Lakulīśvara, Bhārabhūtīśvara, Āṣāḍhīśvara, Diṇḍīśvara, Mahākāla, Bhairava, Vimaleśvara, Bhīmeśvara and Sthāṇvīśvara. The forty, then, are as follows with the names of the presiding Śivas, where these differ, in parentheses. (1) Lākula (BCDF) / Lākulin (AEG) / Nakulīśvara (H), (2) Bhārabhūti, (3) Diṇḍimuṇḍi (AFH) / Diṇḍi/Diṇḍīśa (BCDEG), (4) Āṣāḍhi/Āṣāḍhīśa, (5) Puṣkara (Ajāgandhi), (6) Naimiṣa/Naimiśa (Devadeva), (7) Prabhāsa (Śaśibhūṣaṇa [= Someśvara]), (8) Amareśvara (Oṃkāra) ; (9) Bhairava/Mahābhairava, (10) Kedāra (Īśāna), (11) Mahākāla, (12) Madhyama/Madhyameśa/Madhyamakeśvara, (13) Āmrātikeśvara/Āmrātakeśvara (Śarva), (14) Jalpa/ Jalpeśvara (Sūkṣma), (15) Hariścandra (Hara), (16) Śrīparvata/Śrīśaila (Tripuraghna [= Tripurāntaka]), (17) Bhīma/Bhīmeśvara/Bhīmakeśvara (C), (18) Mahendra (CEG)/Māhendra (ABF) (Mahant [D] / Vrateśa [C] [Mahāvrata]), (19) Aṭṭahāsa (Mahānāda) [CD]), (20) Vimala/Vimaleśvara, (21) Kanakhala (AFHG) / Nakhala (BCDE) (Īśa [D], Nakhaleśa [C]), (22) Nakhala/Nākhala (Ugra [D] Nākhaleśa [C]), (23) Kurukṣetra (Svayambhū [D], Rudra [C]), (24) Gayā (Pitāmahapitṛ [D] Prapitāmaha [C]), (25) Sthūleśvara / Devadāruvana (A) (Sthūleśvara), (26) Sthaleśvara (Mahāliṅga), (27) Śaṅkukarṇa (Mahātejas), (28) Kālañjara (Nīlakaṇṭha), (29) Maṇḍaleśvara (Śrīkaṇṭha), (30) Mākoṭa (Mahotkaṭa [*mahān utkaṭaḥ*]), (31) Dviraṇḍa (ACE) / Duraṇḍa (BFHG) (Ūrdhvaretas), (32) Chagalaṇḍa (A [Chagaraṇḍa] BCEH) / Chagalāṇḍa (FG) (Kaparda), (33) Sthāṇu/Sthāṇvīśvara (H), (34) Suvarṇākṣa/ Svarṇākṣa (Sahasrākṣa), (35) Bhadrakarṇa (Śiva), (36) Gokarṇa (Mahābala), (37) Mahālaya (Rudra), (38) Avimukta (Trimūrti), (39) Rudrakoṭi (Mahāyogin), (40) Vastrāpada (FBCE, G [Ambarāpada]) / Bhastrāpada (AH) (Bhava). Of these the following would seem to be of particular antiquity, since they are already mentioned as sacred places associated with Śiva/Maheśvara in the pilgrimage text of the *Āraṇyakaparva* of the *Mahābhārata*: Mahākāla, Sthāṇutīrtha, Śaṅkukarṇeśvara, Vastrāpada, Rudrakoṭi, Suvarṇākṣa, Bhadrakarṇeśvara, Śrīparvata, and Gokarṇa. Vārāṇasī is associated with Maheśvara there; but there is no mention of Avimukta.

201. The original *Skandapurāṇa* (167.118–149) says that Śiva incarnated himself at Kārohaṇa near the Narmadā as Bhārabhūti in the Kṛtayuga, as Diṇḍimuṇḍa (*sic*) in the Tretāyuga, as Āṣāḍhi in the Dvāparayuga, and as the Guru of Kauśika, Gārgya, Mitra and [Kuruṣya], that is to say as Lakulīśvara/Nakulīśvara, in the Kaliyuga. Kārohaṇa, the supposed site of the revelation of the Pāśupata system, is modern Kārvān, a large village in the Dabhoi Taluk of the old Baroda State in Central Gujerat about 18 miles south of Baroda, not far from the Narmadā, probably once a station on the road from ancient Ujjayinī to ancient Bhṛgukaccha (mod. Broach). According to *Matsyapurāṇa*, *Adhyāya* 194 (in the *Narmadāmāhātmya*) Bhārabhūti is a Śivakṣetra on the Narmadā below Broach. It is no doubt the Bhádbhut (*sic*) on the north bank of the Narmadā about 8 miles from Broach reported to be the site of a Śiva in whose honour there is or was a pilgrimage every nineteen or twenty years in *The Gazetteer of the Bombay Presidency, Gujerát: Surat and Broach* (Bombay: Government Central Press, 1877), 550–551. In the Gazetteer of the Ordnance Survey the village is written more correctly as Bharbhut. Āṣāḍhi is mentioned in passing by the *Matsyapurāṇa*'s version of the *Narmadāmāhātmya* after Bhārabhūti and before Strītīrtha. I have no information on the location of Diṇḍimuṇḍi/Diṇḍi, but it too was doubtless in this area. These four then, which head the lists, are Pāśupata sites. Of the other four, Amareśvara and Prabhāsa too were Pāśupata strongholds, to judge from inscriptions surviving at these sites.

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

into existence, which is not likely to be later than the sixth century. In any case it is earlier than the ninth. The Nepalese "Licchavi" script of an undated and fragmentary palm-leaf manuscript of the *Śivadharmottara* suggests that it was penned in that century,[202] and that text is certainly not earlier and very probably later than the *Śivadharma*. That is also the probable date of a fragmentary Nepalese manuscript of the *Sarvajñānottara*, whose script closely resembles that of this *Śivadharmottara* manuscript.[203] We have early Nepalese manuscripts of two other of the Mantramārgic sources that retail this list, one of the *Niśvāsaguhya* from *c.* 900 and one of the *Kiraṇa* from A.D. :924. (B).

3. The forty-eight Śiva sites in the Ur-*Skandapurāṇa*, *Paṭala* 167 (*Śivāyatanavarṇanapaṭala*),[204] which has come down to us in a Nepalese manuscript of A.D. 810.[205] It is unlikely that this text was composed later than the end of the seventh century or earlier than the sixth.[206] Its background is the pre-Tantric Atimārga (C).

202. This manuscript is NAK 5-892, NGMPP Reel No. A 12/3.

203. The *Sarvajñānottara* manuscript is NAK MS 1-1692, NGMPP Reel No. A 43/12.

204. First (167.1–28) come nine sites that humans cannot reach: (1) Ādityabandhana, a peak in the Vindhya mountains; (2) Hemasomodbhava, a peak in the Himālaya; (3) Lake Satya on the Mountain of the Sunrise (Udayagiri); (4) the Mahānīla Liṅga in the hermitage on Mt. Uśīrabīja; (5) the golden Liṅga on a peak on the unilluminated northern side of Mt. Meru; (6) the vast Liṅga installed by Jaigīṣavya on the Mountain of the Sunset (Astaparvata); (7) the Liṅga installed by Indra in the Nandana park; (8) the Liṅga of rock crystal installed by the Bālakhilyas in the ocean of milk; (9) and the golden Liṅga Kubereśvara installed by Kubera on Mt. Gandhamādana. Then (167.29–204) the text teaches the holy temples of Rudra (167.205: *puṇyāni rudrasyāyatanāni*) that are accessible to humans (167.29b: *gamyāni puruṣaiḥ*). They are as follows. (1) Mahālaya, (2) Kedāra, (3) Madhyameśvara, (4) Gaurīśikhara (the site of Umā's asceticism), (5) Mt. Ṛṣabha (the site of Nandin's asceticism), (6) the Himalayan peak that is the site of Rudra Bhastreśvara, (7) Kanakhala at Gaṅgādvāra, the site of Bahurūpeśvara, (8) Japyeśvara, (9) Mahābhairava, (10) Kumbhakāreśvara, (11) Utkuṭukeśvara, (12) Chagalaṇḍeśvara (10–12 are within the domain of Mahābhairava), (13) Rudrakoṭi, (14) the Devadāruvana, (15) Sthāneśvara installed by Dadhīca, (16) Takṣakeśvara on the bank of the Ganges, (17) Āmrāteśvara installed by Agastya, (18) the Liṅga on Mt. Kālañjara, (19) Puṣpabhadra in the Vindhya mountains installed by the Rākṣasa Meghanāda, (20) Citraratha in Andhra, (21) Śrīparvata in Andhra, where Śilāda installed a thousand Liṅgas, (22) Uttaragokarṇa, (23) [Dakṣiṇa-]Gokarṇa, (24) Mt. Hariścandra, (25) Kārohaṇa to the north of the river Narmadā: Śiva was incarnated here as Bhārabhūti (in the Kṛta age), Diṇḍimuṇḍa (in the Tretā), Āṣāḍhi (in the Dvāpara) and Lakulīśvara (in the Kali): all have their temples: (26) Avimukteśvara in Benares, (27) Prayāga, (28) Naimiśa, (29) Kurukṣetra, (30) Grdhrakūṭeśvara at Gayā, (31) Prahasiteśvara in Magadha at Pāṭalīputra (eight sites in Magadha sanctified by the sojourn of Lakulīśvara and his disciples mentioned but not named), (32) a site among the Yavanas, (33) Hemacūḍeśvara in Aṅga, (34) the Liṅga *Brahmeśvara (*brahmaṇā sthāpitaṃ liṅgam*) installed where the Ganges meets the sea, (35) Prabhāsa, (36) Puṣkara, (37) the temple of Rudra on Mt. Mahendra, (38) Mahākāleśvara in Ujjayinī, (39) Drimicaṇḍeśvara, (40) Śaṅkukarṇeśvara, (41) Diṅgeśvara in the Himālaya, (42) Suvarṇākṣa, (43) the temple of Rudra at Saptagodāvara, (44) Bhadreśvara, (45) Ekāmra in Orissa, (46) Virajā in Orissa, (47) Nepāla (Paśupati), (48) Naikatuṅgādhipeśvara in the Himālaya. The total of forty-eight sites is as I have counted them. It has not been stated in the text itself. One might more accurately count forty-five, since Kumbhakāreśvara, Utkuṭukeśvara and Chagalaṇḍeśvara are properly subsumed under Mahābhairava ; see BISSCHOP 2004: 3, n. 1. Drimicaṇḍeśvara is probably the tīrtha Drimi associated with the worship of Maheśvara in the pilgrimage text of the *Mahābhārata* (3.80.87).

205. NAK 2-229. For this date see ADRIAENSEN, BAKKER and ISAACSON 1998, 32.

206. Yuko YOKOCHI has observed (1999a: 81–82) that the icon of the goddess Mahiṣāsuramardinī seen in texts of the sixth and seventh centuries gives way to a new iconic type around the beginning of the eighth century and that the original *Skandapurāṇa* belongs with the earlier sources in this regard. The same scholar has argued (1999b: 68–75) that the "Gupta" type of this icon seen in the *Skandapurāṇa* corresponds closely to the subtype seen in a sixth-century image in the Siddhi-kī-Guphā at Deogarh and concludes that there is a distinct possibility that the text was composed in that century.

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

4. The sixty-eight Śiva sites of the *Tīrthamāhātmya* of the *Nāgarakhaṇḍa* of the Venkatesvara Press *Skandapurāṇa* (Adhyāyas 108–109).[207] This list, though appearing in a composite text of uncertain date, is ancient enough to have provided the sixty-eight Rudras of the nine cremation grounds of the initiation Maṇḍala of the *Picumata* (*Brahmayāmala*), a work whose earliest surviving manuscript is from A.D. 1052,[208] and

207. The source gives the sites and the names of the presiding Śivas, as follows: (1) Vārāṇasī: Mahādeva; (2) Prayāga: Maheśvara; (3) Naimiṣa: Devadeva; (4) Gayāśiras: Prapitāmaha; (5) Kurukṣetra: Sthāṇu; (6) Prabhāsa: Śaśiśekhara ; (7) Puṣkara: Ajāgandhi; (8) Viśveśvara: Viśva; (9) Aṭṭahāsa: Mahānāda; (10) Mahendra: Mahāvrata; (11) Ujjayinī: Mahākāla; (12) Marukoṭi/Marukoṭa [= the Āgamic Mākoṭa]: Mahotkaṭa; (13) Śaṅkukarṇa: Mahāteja; (14) Gokarṇa: Mahābala (15) Rudrakoṭi: Mahāyoga; (16) Sthaleśvara: Mahāliṅga; (17) Harṣita: Harṣa; (18) Vṛṣabhadhvaja: Vṛṣabha; (19) Kedāra: Īśāna; (20) Madhyamakeśvara: Śarva; (21) Suvarṇākṣa: Sahasrākṣa; (22) Kārttikeśvara: Susūkṣma; (23) Vastramārga/Vastrāpatha: Bhava; (24) Kanakhala: Ugra (sic also *Liṅgapurāṇa* 1.7.32; according to Ur-*Skandapurāṇa* 167.64 the Śiva is Bahurūpeśvara [Ugra=Aghora=Bahurūpa]); (25) Bhadrakarṇa: Śiva; (26) Daṇḍaka: Daṇḍin; (27) Tridaṇḍā (= Āgamic Dviraṇḍa/Duraṇḍa): Ūrdhvareta; (28) Kṛmijāṅgala: Caṇḍīśvara; (29) Ekāmra: Kṛttivāsa; (30) Chāgalaka/Chāgaleya (= Āgamic Chagalaṇḍa/Chagalāṇḍa): Kapardin; (31) Kāliñjara: Nīlakaṇṭha; (32) Maṇḍaleśvara: Śrīkaṇṭha; (33) Kāśmīra: Vijaya; (34) Marukeśvara: Jayanta; (35) Hariścandra: Hara; (36) Puraścandra: Śaṅkara; (37) Vāmeśvara: Jaṭin; (38) Kukkuṭeśvara: Saumya; (39) Bhasmagātra: Bhūteśvara; (40) Oṃkāra: Amarakaṇṭaka; (41) Trisandhyā: Tryambaka; (42) Virajā: Trilocana; (43) Arkeśvara: Dīpta; (44) Nepāla: Paśupati (*paśupālakaḥ*); (45) Duṣkarṇa: Yamaliṅga; (46) Karavīra: Kapālin; (47) Jāgeśvara: Triśūlin; (48) Śrīśaila: Tripurāntaka; (49) Ayodhyā: Rohaṇa; (50) Pātāla: Hāṭakeśvara; (51) Kārohaṇa: Nakulīśa; (52) Devikā river: Umāpati; (53) Bhairava: Bhairavākāra; (54) Pūrvasāgara: Amara; (55) Saptagodāvarītīrtha/Saptagodāvara: Bhīma; (56) Nirmaleśa: Svayambhū; (57) Karṇikāra: Gaṇādhyakṣa; (58) Kailāsa: Gaṇādhipa; (59) Jāhnavītīra/Gaṅgādvāra: Himasthāna; (60) Jalaliṅga: Jalapriya; (61) Vāḍavāgni: Anala; (62) Badarītīrtha/Badarikāśrama: Bhīma; (63) Koṭitīrtha/Śreṣṭha: Koṭīśvara; (64) Vindhya: Vārāha; (65) Hemakūṭa: Virūpākṣa; (66) Gandhamādana: Bhūrbhuva; (67) Liṅgeśvara: Varada; and (68) Laṅkā/Laṅkādvāra: Narāntaka.

208. There are eight Rudras in each of the eight peripheral cremation grounds and four at the centre of the Maṇḍala. They are identical, with only a few discrepancies, with those of *Skandapurāṇa*'s sixty-eight sites. The source is *Picumata*, f. 8r5–9r3 (3.132–156): 132 *pūrve *mahāśmaśāne* (corr. : *mahāśmaśānes* Cod.) *tu mahādevaṃ tu viṇyaset / karṇṇikāyāṃ likhen mantrī pūrvapatre tathaiva ca /* 133 **maheśvaraṃ* (em. : *māheśvaraṃ* Cod.) *tathāgneye devadevan tu dakṣiṇe / ālikhet tu dale mantrī nairitye prapitāmaham /* 134 *paścime tu vidu sthānam *ajāgandhiṃ* (em. : *ajogandhaṃ* Cod.) *ca vāyave / viśveśvaraṃ tathaiva ca ālikhedd uttare dale /* 135 *īśāne tu mahānādaṃ viṇyasen mantravit kramāt / mahāvanaṃ tathāgneye mahāghaṇṭeśvaraṃ likhet /* 136 *mahāvrataṃ tathā caiva tathā caiva mahotkaṭam / tathā likhen mahātejaṃ tathā caiva mahābalam /* 137 *mahāyogaṃ tathā caiva tathā sthūleśvaraṃ punaḥ / harikeśvaraṃ tathā cāṇyaṃ sarvatra navamaṃ smṛtam /* 138 *dakṣiṇe tu dale devi aṭṭahāsaṃ samālikhet / punaś caivāṭṭahāsan tu tasya pūrve tu patrake /* 139 *īśānāñ ca tathā rudraṃ sahasrākṣaṃ tathaiva ca / bhairavaṃ ca tathā ugraṃ ūrdhvareta kapardinam /* 140 *nairite navake ramye ālikhec *chaśibhūṣaṇam* (corr. : *chaśibhūṣiṇam* Cod.) */ śaśibhūṣaṇaṃ punaś caiva kīrttivāsaṃ tathaiva ca /* 141 *punaḥ pūrvadale caiva viṇyasec chaśibhūṣaṇam / āmrātikeśvaraṃ caiva nīlakaṇṭhaṃ tathaiva ca /* 142 *śrīkaṇṭhañ ca mahāyogī tathā ca hāṭakeśvaram / tathaiva vijayan devi navamaṃ parikīrttitam /* 143 *paścime tu mahākālaṃ karṇṇikāyāṃ samālikhet / pūrvapatre tathā caiva mahākālaṃ samālikhet /* 144 *śaṅkarañ ca haraṃ caiva jaṭi saumyan tathāparam / tryambakañ ca tathā cāṇyaṃ tathā cāṇyaṃ trilocanaṃ /* 145 *triśūlinaṃ tathā cāṇyaṃ navamaṃ parikīrttitam / vāyavye tu gaṇādhyakṣaṃ tathā ca tripurāntakam /* 146 *lakulīśaṃ tathā caiva tathā caiva umāpatim / paśupatiñ ca tathā devaṃ tathā kāmeśvaraṃ likhet /* 147 *amareśvaraṃ tathā caiva oṃkāraṃ ca tathāparam / navamañ ca tathā bhūmaṃ viṇyasen mantravit kramāt /* 148 *uttare bhuvane devi ekapādan tu bhairavam / svayaṃbhuñ ca tathā caiva tathā caiva gaṇāpatim /* 149 *virūpākṣan tathā caiva bhūrbhuvan tu samālikhet / tathā caiva himasthānam analeśvaram eva ca /* 150 *bhasmagātraṃ tathā caiva kirāteśvaram eva ca / navamaṃ tu samākhyātam *uttare nātra* (corr. : *uttareṇātra* Cod.) *saṃśayaḥ /* 151 *īśāne tu mahādevi hetukeśvaram ālikhet / vārāhañ ca tathā śreṣṭhaṃ raviṣṭa jambukeśvaram /* 152 *prahasitañ ca mahādevi tathā devi tathā caiva jaleśvaram / aśubhañ ca tathā caiva varadaṃ navamaṃ smṛtam /* 153 *mūlāsanasya tathā devi tathā caiva jaleśvaram / aśubhañ ca tathā caiva varadaṃ navamaṃ smṛtam /* 153 *mūlāsanasya deveśi brahmasthānābjake tathā / karṇṇikāyāṃ catuṣkan tu rudrāṇāṃ viniveśayet /* 154 *sinharūpā mahādevi*

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

to have been mentioned by the Kashmirian scholar Kṣemarāja (*fl. c.* A.D. 1000–1050) (D).[209]

The nineteen Khmer doubles of the Śivas of these lists, five of them appearing more than once, are the following: (1) an Amareśvara (ABD),[210] (2) an Avimuktakeśvara (ABC), (3) six Āmrātakeśvaras (BCD) along the length of the Mekong river from Kratie down to the Delta,[211] (4) a Kanakaleśvara, which is no doubt an orthographical errror for Kanakhaleśvara (BC), (5) Kālañjaleśvara,[212] which is probably the same for Kālañjareśvara (BCD), (6) a Kedāreśvara (ABCD), (7) a Tripurāntakeśvara (BD), (8) a Naimiśeśvara (BCD), (9) three Puṣkareśvaras (BCD), (10) two Prabhāsasomeśvaras (BCD),[213] (11) a Prahasiteśvara (CD),[214] (12) a + karṇṇeśvara (K. 719), probably for Gokarṇeśvara (BCD), Bhadrakarṇeśvara (BD) or Śaṅkukarṇeśvara (BCD), (13) several Bhadreśvaras (C [= Bhadrakarṇeśvara]), (14) a +++trāpadeśvara (K. 46), which is probably Vastrāpadeśvara/ Bhastrāpadeśvara (BCD), (15) a Bhīmeśvara (BD), (16) a Maṇḍaleśvara (BD), (17) two Rudramahālayas (BC),[215] (18) a Vijayeśvara (D), and (19) a Vimaleśvara (B).

We should probably add (20) Siddheśvara, of which several installations are recorded in pre-Angkorean inscriptions. I find the name in our lists only in a variant of B found in the *Matsyapurāṇa*, in which it is compounded with the familiar Mahālaya.[216] But there is evidence of numerous Indian Siddheśvaras, many with Pāśupata associations: at the Nolamba capital Hemavatī (Pāśupata);[217] at Eḍedore;[218] at Palārī, about 20 km north of Sirpur, in ancient Dakṣiṇa Kosala (Pāśupata);[219] at Barākar in the Burdwan District of Bengal (Pāśupata);[220] at Māndhātā on the Narmadā (Pāśupata);[221] at Somnāthpattan/-Prabhāsa in Kāṭhiāwāḍ;[222] and at Loharī in Rajasthan.[223]

---

*trtatvasyāpi *copari* (conj. : *kopari* Cod.) / *amareśvarañ ca *āgneye* (corr. : *agneye* Cod.) *karṇṇikāyān tu viṇyaset* / 155 *oṃkāra nairite bhāge diṇḍi vai vāyugocare* / *īśāne ca tathā *diṇḍiṃ* (conj. : *caṇḍī* Cod.) *sinharūpās tu viṇyaset*. The hypermetrical Harikeśvara of v. 137 is for Harṣeśvara, probably through Harikheśvara.

209. *Svacchandoddyota* vol. 5a, p. 103: *vārāṇasyādigataśrīmahā*devādyaṣṭaṣaṣṭeś* (em. : *devāṣṭa-ṣaṣṭeś* Ed.) 'the sixty-eight beginning with Mahādeva in Vārāṇasī etc.'.

210. I have given references to the Khmer inscriptions that record these foundations only in those cases that cannot be found through the index of names in *IC* vol. 8. I cannot assert with the incomplete materials at my disposal that this list is exhaustive, but am confident that at worst it is nearly so.

211. VICKERY 1998, 379.

212. Ka. 39, *NIC* II–III, 211–213.

213. The Śiva of Prabhāsa is called Śaśibhūṣaṇa or Śaśiśekhara in the Indian lists used here. But the name Someśvara or Somanātha is elsewhere standard for this deity.

214. According to the original *Skandapurāṇa* (167.181) this is the Śiva of Pāṭalīputra in Magadha: *anyad āyatanaṃ puṇyaṃ magadhāsu pinākinaḥ* / *nagare pāṭalīputre nāmnā prahasiteśvaram*.

215. In the Indian lists cited here the place is Mahālaya and the presiding Śiva is Rudra. But the name Rudramahālaya is seen in a context that suggests that the same place is intended in Devala as quoted by Lakṣmīdhara in his *Kṛtyakalpataru*, *Tīrthavivecanakāṇḍa* p. 250: *kṣetrāṇi vārāṇasī mahābhairavaṃ devadāruvanaṃ kedāraṃ *madhyamam rudramahālayam*.

216. *Matsyapurāṇa* 181.25–26c: *vastrāpadaṃ* (em. : *vastrapadaṃ* Ed.) *rudrakoṭiṃ siddheśvara-mahālayam* / *gokarṇaṃ rudrakarṇaṃ ca suvarṇākṣaṃ tathaiva ca* / *amaraṃ ca mahākālaṃ tathā kāyāvarohaṇam* / *etāni hi pavitrāṇi*.

217. *EC* 12: Si 28.

218. *EC* 7: Sh. 40.

219. *EITA* 2i:245, plates 490-491.

220. *EITA* 2ii:406, plate 881.

221. *Kūrmapurāṇa* 2.39.58.

222. See OZHA 1889.

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

There are at least six more pre-Angkorean Śivas that are likely to have been named after Indian prototypes that are not listed in A, B, C or D. These are (21) Acaleśvara, (22) Kadambakeśvara/Kadambeśvara, (23) Piṅgaleśvara, (24) Vīreśvara, (25) Vṛddheśvara, and (26) Tuṅgīśa (= Tuṅgeśvara). There are Acaleśvaras on Mt. Abu, within the bounds of Achalgarh on that mountain,[224] Śrīśailam[225] and Tiruvārūr;[226] Kadambakeśvara/Kadambeśvaras at Śrīśailam[227] and in Kashmir;[228] Piṅgaleśvaras on the Narmadā river[229] and in Kashmir;[230] a Vīreśvara in Vārāṇasī, venerated by those seeking male offspring,[231] a Vṛddheśvara in Kārohaṇa (Karvan), the supposed place of Rudra's incarnation as Lakulīśa, the origin of the Pāśupata teaching,[232] and a Tuṅgeśvara in Kashmir and another listed in the *Liṅgapurāṇa* as one of six Śaiva sites propitious for the practice of the text's Pāśupata Yoga.[233]

Bhadreśvara

Of these Khmer doubles Bhadreśvara appears to have been especially revered. Its Indian eponym, at Kanakhala in Brahmāvarta, the area within North India venerated as Brahmanism's purest territory, that most fit for the performance of its sacrifices, was believed to have been installed by the deity Brahmā to mark the site of what is arguably the pivotal episode in the devotional mythology (*śivakathāḥ*) of the Śaiva religion, that in which Dakṣa's Vedic Aśvamedha sacrifice was destroyed as punishment for his failure to include Śiva among the gods invited to receive a share of the offerings.[234]

There were several Bhadreśvaras in Kambujadeśa, a fact that attests the special status of this Śiva among the Khmers,[235] but the most important, and perhaps the original, was at a temple-complex whose architectural remains date from the 7th to the 12th centuries A.D.

---

223. Dasharatha SHARMA 1959, 231 ('Pāśupata').

224. See the inscription of 1331 edited in *EI* 30:10 and *Śivapurāṇa* 4.2.26.

225. *Liṅgapurāṇa* 1.92.165.

226. For the ancient Acaleśvara at Tiruvārūr mentioned by Appar, now in the second prākāra of the Tyāgarāja temple, rebuilt in stone by Sembiyan Mahādevī, see BALASUBRAHMANYAM 1971, 195–197.

227. *Liṅgapurāṇa* 1.92.161.

228. *Nīlamata* 120.

229. *Kūrmapurāṇa* 2.39.21–22.

230. *Nīlamata* 1031; *Haracaritacintāmaṇi* 11.29.

231. *Śivapurāṇa, Śatarudrasaṃhitā*. Adhyāyas 13–14.

232. *Kāravaṇamāhātmya* p. 53. D.R. BHANDARKAR (1909: 182, 184) reports that there is still a Vrddheśvara at Karvan and that the image in the sanctum of the Nakleśvar temple is pointed out as the conjoint figure of Brahmeśvara and Lakulīśa.

233. *Nīlamata* 1368c: *tuṅgeśatīrthakṣetraṃ tu*; *Liṅgapurāṇa* 1.92.7: *vārāṇasīkurukṣetraśrīparvatamahālaye / tuṅgeśvare ca kedāre tatsthāne yo yatir bhavet*. Of these Liṅgas with Indian prototypes 1–4, 6, 8–10, 15–18, 20 and 22–24 have been identified by Kamaleswar BHATTACHARYA (1961 : 50–56 [À propos de quelques nom de Śiva].

234. The installation of the Indian Bhadreśvara by Brahmā at Kanakhala just south of modern Hardwar and the tradition that it was the site of the overthrow of Dakṣa's Aśvamedha by Bhadrakālī and the Gaṇeśvara Hari/Haribhadra/Vīrabhadra are the subject of the thirty-second chapter of the original *Skandapurāṇa*. This Rudrakṣetra, whose sanctity is declared to extend in all directions for a distance of one yojana around the Liṅga (32.164), is said there to contain the Bhadrakarṇa lake (32.166) and to be situated near Kubjāmra (32.171–176). Evidently, then, Bhadreśvara is none other than the Bhadrakarṇeśvara already reported to be situated near Kubjāmra by the *Mahābhārata* (*Āraṇyakaparvan* 82.35–36) in its account of the pilgrimage route from Kurukṣetra to Prayāga.

235. See, e.g., K. 81; K. 136 A, v. 10; K. 162; K. 190 A, v. 24; K. 258; K. 728; K. 809; K. 818; K. 940; K. 958, v. 16.

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

located at Vat Phu near the ancient town of Liṅgapura, near the foot of Phu Kao massif (1,416 m.) in the Champasak District of southern Laos close to the modern Lao-Cambodian border.

Mt. Phu Kao, known in our inscriptions as the Mountain of the Liṅga (*liṅgaparvataḥ*, *liṅgādriḥ*), owed its ancient name to an impressive Liṅga-like outcrop on the summit at the centre of the massif. A deity personifying the mountain (*bhagavān śrīliṅgaparvataḥ*), probably a Śiva, is mentioned in a fragmentary inscription assigned on palaeographic grounds to the second half of the fifth century found close to the mountain in the remains of an as yet unidentified city.[236] A royal decree from the reign of Jayavarman I (657, –690+) expresses the wish that the endowments of this god be used to good effect and underlines the sanctity of the area by prohibiting persons (1) from taking the life of any creatures that dwell on the mountain, even if they are criminals deserving punishment, (2) from moving about in its hermitage without restraint, riding in carriages, with raised umbrellas and chowries, and (3) from feeding or raising dogs and chickens on the god's lands.[237] The God Liṅgaparvata is also mentioned as the recipient of a silver bowl donated by Śaṅkarapaṇḍita, the priest (Purohita) of Harṣavarman III (r. 1066/7–1080) and his two predecessors,[238] and as the recipient of a platter offered by king Tribhuvanādityavarman (r. *c.* 1165–1177 A.D.) to mark the occasion of the second annual Koṭihoma after his accession.[239]

As for the outcrop after which the mountain was named, it was not perceived as merely Liṅga-like. It was venerated as a Liṅga, under the name Niṣkala;[240] and the remnants of the brick foundations of a temple have been discovered on its top, with a carved sandstone Linga lying at its foot.[241] In the Indian Śaiva tradition natural Liṅgas of this kind are termed self-created (*svayambhu*) or self-manifest (*svayaṃvyaktam*) and they

236. K. 365 (fragmentary; found at Wat Luong Kau, 6.5 kilometres east of Vat Phu), A, v. 2: *bhagavatā śrīliṅgaparvvatenāsmin* .... The city, on the alluvial plain on the west bank of the Mekong River, with an archaeological area of about 400 hectares, has tentatively been identified as Śreṣṭhapura; see UNESCO 1999, 70 (1.3.23). But this appears to rest on no firmer foundation than the long established assumption that Śreṣṭhapura was near Vat Phu. VICKERY (1998, 346, 410–413) has shown the weakness of this assumption and has argued convincingly that the evidence points, though not conclusively, to a site in the central Angkor region between Siem Reap and Kompong Thom.

237. K. 367, ed. SALOMON 1998 (281–284), v. 4b–5: *atra śrīmati liṅgaparvva[tava]re ye sthāyinaḥ prāṇi[naḥ] (8) vaddhyantān na janena kenacid api prāptāparādhāḥ kadā devāya pratipāditaṃ yad iha taddhemādikaṃ siddhyatu // (9) devasyāsya yathābhilāṣagamanā gacchantu naivāśra[me] yānārohadhṛtātapatraracanābhyutkṣiptasaccāmaraiḥ / (10) poṣyāḥ kukkurakukkuṭā na ca janair ddevasya bhūmaṇḍaleṣv ity ājñāvanipasya tasya bhavatu kṣmāyām alaṅghyā nṛṇām.*

238. K. 136, Khmer ll. 29–30: *kamrateṅ jagat liṅgaparvvata khāl prāk 1.*

239. K. 418 B (undated): *+ + + kamrateṅ aṅ śrītribhuvanādityavarmmadeva ta kamrateṅ jagat liṅgaparvvata nā thve dvitiya vraḥ koṭihoma* '[Offered by] K.A. Śrī Tribhuvanādityavarmmadeva to K.J. Liṅgaparvvata when the second Koṭihoma was celebrated.' See CŒDÈS 1929, 305–6, arguing that this would have been one year after his accession, since the first Koṭihoma was at the time of his accession. But K. 194, which he cites as evidence that the Koṭihoma was performed at the time of accession, says only that it is performed every year after accession, as do our Indian authorities on royal ceremonies. These do not require it among the ceremonies of accession itself.

240. K. 583, v. 6 (as edited in JACQUES 1976b). That Niṣkala is its name rather than a description of a type of Liṅga, i.e. 'subtle', 'interior' (BHATTACHARYA 1967) or 'simple', that is to say a Liṅga proper without faces (BRUNNER-LACHAUX 1968, 445–447), follows from the accompanying Khmer text, in which it is called *vraḥ kamrateṅ aṅ śrī niṣkala* (ll. 3–4). This was pointed out by DAGENS in a private communication reported by JACQUES in his edition of the inscription (1976b, 368). The sense of *niṣkala-* that justifies its technical use to denote the simple kind of Liṅga is 'undifferentiated'. This would be even more appropriate as a name for a Liṅga that has not been formed in any way by man.

241. See UNESCO 1999, 54 (1.3.2).

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

differ from other Liṅgas in that they may be of any shape, size and colour, may be found anywhere in nature, and are permanently and unconditionally imbued with Śiva's presence. They need no base (*pīṭhaḥ*) or shrine to support and house them, but may be provided with these and in this sense 'installed'. Furthermore they lack the differentiation into lower, middle and upper sections that characterizes ordinary, man-made Liṅgas.[242] So

242. For these features of the *svayambhuliṅgam* see *Īśanaśivagurudevapaddhati*, *Kriyāpāda* 38.4–10b: *atha svayambhuliṅgāni *jarjarāṇi* (corr. : *jarjharāṇi* Ed.) *kṛśāni ca / hrasvāni cātidīrghāni phalakāsadṛśāni ca / 5 anekāgrāṇi gokarṇamātuluṅganibhāny api / saṭpañcatridaśāgrāṇi mānonmānādibhir vinā / 6 śṛṅgāgrāṇy api vakrāṇi nānāvarṇākṛtīni ca / sapīṭhāny apy apīṭhāni sālayāny agṛhāṇi vā / 7 vanaparvatanadyabdhitīrthakṣetragatāny api / darśanasparśanārcābhir eṣāṃ siddhir anuttamā / 8 vidyāt svayambhuliṅgāni yeṣu nityaṃ sthitaḥ śivaḥ / mūlaṃ na śodhayet teṣāṃ śodhanaṃ sarvanāśakṛt / 9 amīmāṃsyāni tāny āhuḥ pūjyāny eva yathāsthiti / naiṣāṃ mūrtivibhāgo 'sti na ca syān mantrasaṅkaraḥ / 10 mānuṣeṣv eva liṅgeṣu mantramūrtyādisaṅkaraḥ* 'As for self-born Liṅgas they may be split, narrow, short, extremely long, slab-like, with more than one summit, with the shape of a cow's ear or a Mātuluṅga fruit, with six, five or thirty protuberances at the top, without conformity to any of the rules of height, width and the rest, crooked, of various colours and shapes, with or without a pedestal. with or without a shrine to house them, located in the wilderness, on mountains, in rivers, the ocean or at holy bathing places and sacred sites. By seeing them, touching them or worshipping them the highest Siddhi [is attained]. One should know that it is in self-born Liṅgas [alone] that Śiva is permanently [and unconditionally] present. One should not purify the original [Liṅga]. To do so would cause universal destruction. [The learned] declare that these [Liṅgas] should not be examined [to determine whether they are in a state fit for worship]. They should be worshipped as they are. They do not have [the usual] division into the [three] segments; nor is it possible to be guilty of mixing Mantras [of different classes]. [The danger of] mixing Mantras and icons applies only in the case of Liṅgas installed by human beings.' In ordinary Liṅgas one may not install Mantras of one sort where Mantras of another have already been installed. This restriction does not apply in self-born and other natural Liṅgas such as Bāṇaliṅgas. This is another aspect of their immunity to contamination.

In Śaiva scripture see *Kiraṇa*, f. 74v3: *svayamudbhūtaliṅgasya sthāpitasya maharṣibhiḥ / devair *vā* (em. : *vya* Cod.) *sthāpitasyāpi rūpamānaṃ na gṛhyate* 'Form and dimension are irrelevant in the case of a self-arisen Liṅga or of one that has been installed by a great sage or god'. Differentiation into sections (*mūrtivibhāgaḥ*) is that into the square *brahmabhāgaḥ*, which is the lower third of the Liṅga. the octagonal *viṣṇubhāgaḥ*, which is the central. and the rounded cylindrical *rudrabhāgaḥ*, which is the upper and the only one that is visible once the Liṅga has been installed.

This category of Liṅga is mentioned in K. 762. It records the installation of a natural (*svāyambhuvam*) Liṅga with the name Kedāreśvara in A.D. 673. It is probable that another instance is recorded in K. 400B, v. 4–5: *liṅgaṃ suvarṇṇasaṃghātaṃ surāsuragaṇais tu* ⏑ / *+rggajanitaṃ pu* – ⏑⏑ *āmrātasya kalpitam / [vi]ṣadratnasvarāṅke smin kāle tat sthāpayat tadā* / ⏑⏑ *sadravināny eva so smai prādāc ca bhaktitaḥ*. I propose that the second Pāda read *surāsuragaṇais stutam* 'hymned by all the gods and Asuras'. Cf. the Pāda formula *surāsuranamaskṛtaḥ* that appears frequently in the *Mahābhārata* (1.94.34b etc.) and Purāṇas. For the beginning of the third Pāda CŒDÈS conjectured *svarggajanitaṃ*. But this is implausible because the three syllables after the first may never be ⏑ ⏑ ⏑ , and because the cadence of the Pāda would be a *ma-vipulā* without the required word-break before the closing – ⏑ . It is more probable, therefore, that there were two syllables in the initial lacuna and only one syllable after *pu*. probably *ṇyaṃ*. I propose *nisarggajanitaṃ puṇyaṃ*, understanding the first word to mean 'born by nature, natural'. For the synonym *nisargaja-* in this sense see, e.g., *Manusmṛti* 8.414cd and 9.16ab. As the object of the reverence of both the gods and the Asuras it is appropriate that the Liṅga should be of this kind. That it is a 'natural' Liṅga is also suggested by the expression *suvarṇṇasaṃghātaṃ* 'a conglomeration of gold'. This would be an odd way to refer to a Liṅga cast in gold, but makes good sense if it was rather a naturally Liṅga-shaped nugget. As restored the passage means 'In 790 [Śaka, = 868/9 A.D.] he installed the nugget of gold, an auspicious natural Liṅga that had been hymned by Gods and Asuras'. I leave unsolved the crux ⏑⏑ *āmrātasya kalpitam*, though I suspect a reference to the name of the Liṅga and therefore to Āmrāteśa/Āmrāteśvara/Āmrātakeśvara.

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

it follows that even if they are broken into pieces the deity will remain equally present in each of the fragments. That this view was held by the Khmers may be inferred from the fact that the purpose of the inscription that names this Liṅga is to report that a fragment of it, perhaps detached through erosion, was installed for worship in another place. Dating from the reign of Rājendravarman (944–*c.* 968) the inscription tells us the following about Indrāyudha, a son of king Jayavarman II (r. 802–*c.* 834):

prāg eva campā[dhipa]tigrahaṇe labdhavikramaḥ
tīrttvā kālam va(yo)[vṛ]ddhau śivabhaktiparāyaṇaḥ
gantā liṅgapu(ra)ñ citran tapaḥ kaṣṭañ cakāra saḥ
tataś śivājñayā liṅgam aiśan niṣkalaliṅgataḥ
lavan tat sthāpi[ta]n t[e]na santūnāmni [p]ure mudā

K. 583, v. 4c–6 (ed. JACQUES 1976b)
JACQUES proposes plausibly that *gantā* in 7c is an error for *gantvā*

After many years, having earlier achieved an act of great valour in capturing the king of Campā, he turned in his old age to devotion to Śiva. He went to Liṅgapura and performed various harsh austerities. Then at Śiva's command he took a Liṅga of Śiva that was a fragment [fallen] from the Liṅga [called] Niṣkala [on the summit of the mountain] and joyfully installed it in Santūpura.

Two other Liṅga fragments (*liṅgaikāṃśau*), probably from the same source, are reported to have been installed for worship in Aninditapura by Śivācārya, a Śaiva officiant in the service of the four Khmer kings from Īśānavarman II (r. *c.* 922–*c.* 928) to Rājendravarman (r. 944–968).[243] That this Śaiva dignitary should have chosen to install these fragments where he did is in keeping with his special connection with the Śivaliṅga already established there. Generally the opening verses of the Khmers' Sanskrit inscriptions offer praise or obeisance to one or more deities in their unlocated universality, with the principal deity at the head. In this case after venerating Śiva, Viṣṇu, Brahmā, Umā and Sarasvatī in that manner he adds, most unusually, a verse of devotion addressed to the Śivaliṅga of Aninditapura.[244]

Now the Bhadreśvara enshrined on a terrace near the foot of Mt. Phu Kao and aligned with the natural Liṅga on its summit appears to have been seen as the national deity, in a

---

In K. 806, v. 27 we read of Rājendravarman that 'he increased the endowments of both the natural and the installed deities in Kambujadeśa': *kamvuviśvambharāṇāṃ yas tridaśānāṃ svayambhuvām / sthāpitānāñ ca yajvaiko bhūtvā pūjān avarddhayat*. CŒDÈS missed the meaning of *svayambhuvām* 'natural' and *tridaśānāṃ* here 'gods'. He took the former to mean 'gods' and the latter to indicate their number ('thirty'): 'il accrut le culte des trente dieux érigés sur la terre de Kambu'. The price of this reading was to overlook the conjunction *ca*.

243. K. 532, v. 27: *liṅgaṃ bhīmapure moghapure liṅge ca sa vyadhāt / liṅgaikāṃśau sabhīmārccāv aninditapure punaḥ* 'he installed one Liṅga in Bhīmapura, two in Amoghapura, and two fragments of the Liṅga and an image of Bhīma in Aninditapura'. I suppose that these may be fragments of the Niṣkalaliṅga because I know of no other natural Liṅga that could be intended.

244. K. 532, v. 6: *vande śrīśivaliṅgākhyaṃ śaṅkaraṃ viśvaśaṅkaram / aṇimādiguṇānindyam aninditapurāspadam* 'I venerate the Śaṅkara (Śiva) at Aninditapura, holy Śivaliṅga by name, who bestows joy (*-śaṅkaram*) upon the whole world who is [indeed] irreproachable (*anindya-*) because of [his possession of] the [eight supernatural] attributes [of godly power], minuteness (*aṇimā*) and the rest.' Aninditapura is important in royal genealogies as one of three kingdoms, the other two being Śambhupura and Vyādhapura, from which the early kings of Angkor had descended. But it is not mentioned before the reign of Yaśovarman I (889–910) and its location is uncertain. VICKERY (1998:384) considers it the *puram* of a lineage whose estate was somewhere between Kompong Thom and Kompong Cham, in the central part of modern Kampuchea.

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

role analogous to that of such South Asian Śivas as Naṭarāja of Cidambaram for the Tamils of the Far South and Paśupati of Deopatan for the inhabitants of the Kathmandu Valley. Thus we learn that the lineage of Vidyeśa (*vidyeśavit, vidyeśadhīmān*),[245] a Śaiva Rājaguru of the fourteenth century, had emanated from an Indian Śaiva called Sarvajñamuni who, we are told, had employed Yoga to transport himself from India (*āryadeśaḥ*) to Kambujadeśa to worship Bhadreśvara, mostly that of this site:[246]

> 7 *śa[r]vvapriyo bhavad vipras sarvvāgamaviśārada[ḥ]*
> *sarvvalokārthakṛt nāmnā sarvvajñamunir īri[taḥ]*
> 8 *caturvve[da]nidher yyasya caturānanam āvabhau*
> *caturmmukhasyeva bhṛśañ caturvvedasa* – ∪ –
> 9 *āryya[de]śe samutpannaś śivārādhanatatparaḥ*
> *yo yogenāgataḥ kamvudeśe smin[n] i* ∪ – ∪ –
> 10 *śrībha[dreśvaraśa]mbhor yyo yajanārthaṃ samāgataḥ*
> *cirakālan tam abhyarcya prayayau parama[ṃ] pa[dam]*
> K. 300, vv. 7–10
> 7a *śa[r]vvapriyo* conj. Bergaigne : *śa[r]vva* + + Ep. • 10d parama[ṃ] pa[dam] CŒDÈS : *padam aiśvaraṃ* conj. BERGAIGNE

There was a brahmin devoted to Śiva, skilled in all the [Śaiva] Āgamas, acting for the good of all, called Sarvajñamuni. He had memorized the four Vedas and his skillful mouth loudly [reciting them] seemed like that of the four-faced [Brahmā] himself. He was born in Āryadeśa and devoted himself to the propitiation of Śiva. Having reached this land of Kambu by means of meditation [...] he came to worship Bhadreśvaraśiva and having done so for a long time proceeded [in death] to the ultimate goal.

Moreover, an inscription composed during the reign of Dharaṇīndravarman I (A.D. 1107–1113) by Yogīśvarapaṇḍita, grandson in the maternal line of Vīralakṣmī, daughter of Sūryavarman I (r. 1002–*c.* 1050), in which he records his career as a Śaiva officiant and his lavish donations to Bhadreśvara, refers to the latter in terms that reveal that it was venerated as the source and guarantor of the supremacy of the Khmer emperors.

In the first benedictory verse of that inscription Śiva is revered in abstract, metaphysical terms as that from which all creation flows and as that into which all creation returns:

> *yasmāt kramena sakala . i* ∪ *–dbhavanti*
> *bhūtāni tantuvisarā iva †pūlikāyāḥ†*
> *yatraiva tāni nidha* – ∪ ∪ – *†nidīha†*
> *vyomnīva ta śiva*
> K. 258 C, v. 1

Emending the first quarter verse, restoring diagnostically the sense of the corrupt and lacunose second and third, and providing the last, whose engraving was not completed, with a makeshift ending of the kind required by the context, I propose:

> *yasmāt krameṇa sakalāni samudbhavanti*
> *bhūtāni tantuvisarā iva lūtikāyāḥ*
> *yatraiva tāni nidhanaṃ punar eva yānti*
> *vyomnīva taṃ śiva[*m ahaṃ praṇamāmi bhaktyā (?)]*

245. I propose that the Sanskrit expressions *vidyeśavit* and *vidyeśadhīmān* that refer to him (K. 300, v. 40; K. 300, v. 103) are to be understood as metrical substitutes for the name-title Vidyeśapaṇḍita/ Vidyeśvarapaṇḍita, designations in -paṇḍita being standard for Khmer royal officiants.

246. No later Sanskrit inscription from the Khmer realm has been published.

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

[*With devotion I offer my obeisance (?)] to Śiva, from whom all creatures emerge in due order like threads from a spider, [and] into whom they disappear again as though into space.[247]

In the second verse he is invoked simultaneously in his transcendent nature and in his perceptible manifestation as the deity on the mountain of Bhadreśvara, this double juxtaposition, both between the verses and within the second, heightening the sense of the latter's sanctity:

*sarvveṣām api kāraṇan tri[*jagatāṃ (?)] – – ∪ – yo vibhuś*
śrīmatkamvujadeśabhūpatigaṇāṃs tadbhaktibhūmādarāt
*karttuṃ sarvvamahībhṛtām api [patīn] – – ∪ – [*ā(?)]gataś*
śaśvad vo vatu śaktibhiḥ paśupatiḥ bhadreśvarādrau sphutaḥ

K. 258 C, v. 2

2b *gaṇāṃs* corr : *ganāṃs* CŒDÈS

[I pray] that Paśupati, the Lord of Bound Souls, may protect you at all times with his Powers, he, who though omnipresent (*vibhuḥ*) and the source of the three [*worlds (?)], is visible to us (*sphutaḥ*) on the Bhadreśvara mountain, having [*come down to earth (?)] to make the rulers (*bhūpatigaṇāṃs*) of holy Kambujadeśa [lords] over all [other] kings, [moved] by the great fervour of their devotion.

That the Bhadreśvara mountain of this verse is the mountain of the Liṅga (Phu Kao) with Niṣkalaliṅga as its summit and the temple of Bhadreśvara at its foot is evident from K. 723, an undated pre-Angkorean inscription from the largest of three caves 1500 metres north of Vat Phu, which refers to the consecration of that cave as a place for meditation and locates it "on the side of the Bhadreśvara mountain".[248]

247. Cœdès's reading *pūlikāyāḥ*, which he translated 'd'un écheveau' ('from a skein') is suspect. The word is not found to my knowledge in Sanskrit. At best one may postulate it on the basis of *pūlaḥ*, *pūlakaḥ* 'bunch, bundle'. But even so the sense is not apposite, because the term is used of grass or straw. I see two possibilities. The first is that *pūlikāyāḥ* is an error for *pūṇikāyāḥ* 'from a roll of cotton' or 'from a spindle'. But this too invokes an unrecorded form, one for which we must rely on the Prakrit words *pūṇiā* and *poṇiā*, which are attested in these two meanings respectively, though the analogy is somewhat less inapposite, and the syllables *ṇi* and *li* could easily be confused. However, I have preferred to propose that the author intended *lūtikāyāḥ* 'from a spider'. Though it is a step further away from the reading attested by Cœdès it provides an entirely appropriate sense. For the spider's emanating threads from within its body is well-attested in key Indian theological texts as a metaphor to illustrate how it is that the world can come forth from within its divine source, so that its efficient cause and its material cause (its *nimittakāraṇam* and its *upādānakāraṇam*) are one and the same, whereas the alternatives before us are not found to my knowledge. We see it in the *Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad* 2.1.20, in the Vaidika-Pāśupata *Śvetāśvataropaniṣad* 6.10 and *Muṇḍakopaniṣad* 1.1.7; and it was standard among those emanationist (*pariṇāmavādin*-) Vedāntists who preceded or survived the illusionist reformation of Śaṅkara and Maṇḍanamiśra. Thus it is invoked by Bhāskara *Brahmasūtrabhāṣya* ad 2.1.14 (concerning *Chāndogyopaniṣad* 6.1.4: *mṛttikety eva satyam: apracyutasvabhāvasya śaktivikṣepalakṣaṇaḥ / pariṇāmo yathā tantunābhasya paṭatantuvat*); and it is challenged by the Mīmāṃsaka Kumārila in *Ślokavārtika*, *Saṃbandhākṣepaparihāra* 50c–51, tacitly treating it as a standard argument by analogy. That such emanationism is rejected by the dominant tradition of learned theology within the Siddhānta, the mainstream Śaivism whose rituals and observances were followed among the Khmers is not an argument against this reading. All three readings are equal in that regard, and the fact that those who propagated the Śaiva dualism that strictly separated God as the efficient cause of the universe from *māyā* as its inanimate material cause were followers of this ritual system does not require us to conclude that all its followers adhered to the same view.

248. K. 723: *samādhaye sarvvatapodhanāṇām iyaṃ guhā vaktraśaiheti nāmnā / sā niṣṭhitā vaktraśivena śaktyā vibhāti bhaddreśvaraśailapārśve* 'This cave shines forth on the side of Mt.

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

Though the exact words that occupied the lacuna in the third line cannot be inferred with certainty, there is little room for doubt concerning the meaning intended, namely that Śiva came to earth as the Bhadreśvara of Vat Phu in order to reward the Khmer kings' devotion to him with power over their neighbours. I propose, tentatively, that the noun in the accusative plural required in the lacuna by the context was *patīn* (*karttuṃ sarvvamahībhṛtām api patīn* 'to make [the rulers ...] lords over all [other] kings') because it provides the required sense and fits both the metre and style. As for the last criterion, we see the same expression for the Khmer king as paramount ruler later in this same composition (K. 258 C, v. 6c) in the compounded form *mahībhṛtpatiḥ* and in the uncompounded form in another inscription.[249] It is also alliterative (*api patīn*) and echoed by *paśupatiḥ* in the next Pāda.

There is other evidence of the role of the Śiva Bhadreśvara of Vat Phu as the patron of the Khmer monarchs and thence as the protector of the Khmer realm. After re-occupying the temporarily abandoned city of Angkor (Yaśodharapura) and constructing his new capital on the south bank of the Yaśodharataṭāka or 'Eastern Baray', the vast water reservoir excavated by Angkor's founder Yaśovarman I (r. 889–910), Rājendravarman (r. 944–968) established two eponymous Śivaliṅgas, the first in 953 in the 'Eastern Mebon', a temple-complex on an island constructed for this purpose at the centre of that reservoir, and the second in 961/2 in the central tower at the summit of his pyramid-temple now known as Pre Rup, built at what was probably the centre of his capital. The name of the first of these Śivaliṅgas was formed in accordance with the common practice observed in the Indic world for images of deities enshrined by individuals, that is to say, as a compound consisting of the distinctive part of the individual's name, or of that of a person designated for the honour, followed by a term indicating the universal deity invoked into the image for worship: -īśvara for a Śiva, -svāmin, -mādhava or -nārāyaṇa for a Viṣṇu, -svāmin or -āditya for a Sūrya, and -īśvarī for a goddess.[250]

Bhadreśvara, established to the extent of his ability by Vaktraśiva under the name Vaktraguhā for the meditation practice of all ascetics'.

249. K. 81 A, v. 2 (7th c.): *rājā śrībhavavarmmeti patir āsīn mahībhṛtām.*

250. For these naming conventions see, e.g., *Mohacūrottara*, ff. 34v9–35r1: *yajamānasya yan nāma yojayed īśvareṇa tu* 'he should compound the name of the patron with -īśvara'; Bhojarāja, *Siddhānta-sārapaddhati*, f. 76r4: *yajamānādyam īśvarāntaṃ bhagavate nāma datvā* 'after giving the deity a name that begins with [that of] the patron and ends in -īśvara'; *Somaśambhupaddhati* 4:227 (N-īśvara for a Śiva), 275 (N-īśvarī for a Goddess), 291 (N-svāmin or N-āditya for a Sun), 311 (N-svāmin or N-mādhava for a Viṣṇu); *Īśānaśivagurudevapaddhati Kriyāpāda*, p. 446: *yajamānābhidhānādyaṃ *nāmeśvara*(em. : *nāmaiśvarya* Ed.)*padāntakam* 'the name, beginning with the name of the patron and ending with the word -īśvara'; *Pratiṣṭhāmayūkha*, p. 30b7: *atha kartrnāmayutaṃ devanāma kuryāt sarvadā vyavahārārtham* 'For the sake of mundane transactions one should always give the deity a name compounded with that of the patron'. I interpret the last of these passages as pointing to the fact that the apparent individualization of the deity through the giving of this composite name is understood as a device that enables the deity in the principal image of the temple to be treated in law as the owner of the lands and other goods gifted by the founder and any subsequent benefactors. It has no further reality. The Śiva in an image is never worshipped under this name but only as Śiva pure and simple. That the legal fiction of ownership is the function of the name is implicit in *Somaśambhupaddhati* 4:227 (v. 46): *hiraṇyapaśubhūmyādi gītavādyādihetave / amukeśāya tad bhaktyā śaktyā sarvaṃ nivedayet* 'With devotion he should make over all that he can, such as gold, domestic animals and lands "to N-īśvara" to [fund] the singing, instrumental music and other [expenses of the cult]'. The naming convention is mentioned only in this context. The *Śivāgamaśekhara* cited by BRUNNER-LACHAUX ad loc. elaborates this as follows: *tato rājāntikaṃ kartā gatvā hiraṇyagrāmādi dāsadāsīparyantaṃ nṛttagītādihetave amukeśvarāyeti svaśaktitas tāmraśilāśāsanaṃ kṛtvā nivedayet.* 'Then the patron should go to the king and having prepared a copper-

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

In this case, since the image was a Śivaliṅga it was named Rājendreśvara ('Rājendra[varman]'s Śiva').[251] But the name given to the second was Rājendrabhadreśvara ('Rājendra[varman]'s Bhadreśvara'):

sa śrīrājendrabhadreśvara iti viditaṃ liṅgam atredam agryaṃ
gaurīśaurīśvarāṇāṃ catasṛbhir abhirāmābhir arccābhir ābhiḥ
kīrttiṃ vaktuṃ prasannaṃ mukham iva muditasyorddhvam āsyaiś caturbhiś
śambhor bhāsvadbhir iddhe śikhitanuvasubhis sthāpayām āsa śāke
K. 806, v. 277
277a *atredam* corr. : *atraidam* CŒDÈS • **277d** *vasubhis* corr. : *vasubhi* CŒDÈS

In Śaka 883 [= A.D. 961/2] to proclaim his fame he installed here this excellent Liṅga called Śrī-Rājendrabhadreśvara together with these four lovely images of Gaurī, Viṣṇu and Śiva, resembling the calm upper face of joyful Śiva with his [other] four radiant faces.[252]

This is an altogether exceptional title that expresses both Bhadreśvara's exalted status among the Khmers and his special role as patron of the monarch, a role that was also that of certain

---

plate or stone edict he should donate gold, villages and the rest down to male and female slaves for the sake of the dancing, singing and other [expenses], saying [that he does so] "to N-īśvara".'

251. K. 286, v. 44cd; K. 872, v. 15; K. 528, v. 218.

252. The complex of the Liṅga surrounded by the four images is compared to that of the five faces of Sadāśiva, the form of Śiva venerated in the Siddhānta, which was then the Śaivism of the state. Just as Sadāśiva has a superior upper face (Īśāna) and four lesser faces below it (Tatpuruṣa, Aghora, Sadyojāta and Vāmadeva) looking in the four directions, so this Liṅga shrine has four somewhat lower shrines around it forming the corners (SE, SW, NW, and NE) of a square of which it occupies the centre. For the quincunx layout of the uppermost level of the Rājabhadreśvara temple (Pre Rup) see JACQUES 1999, 76–78. The secondary images, installed in the corner-shrines, were (1) a Rājendravarmeśvara (SE) for the king's own benefit, (2) a Viṣṇu Rājendraviśvarūpa whose purpose is not stated, (3) a Gaurī, probably called Rājendreśvarī, for the salvation of his consort Jayadevī, and (4) a Rājendravarmadeveśvara for the welfare of his younger brother Harṣavarman (K. 806, vv. 278–281).

CŒDÈS translates *liṅgaṃ ...agryaṃ* 'ce liṅga principal' as though it were related to others; but see the following close parallel in a Nepalese inscription of 468/9 A.D. in which another solitary liṅga is so described: *aiśānaṃ liṅgam agryaṃ vidhivad anupamaṃ sthāpayām āsa bhaktyā* (Dh. VAJRĀCĀRYA 1973, No. 6).

CŒDÈS reads *kīrttiṃ vaktuṃ ...muditasya ...āsyaiś caturbhiś* 'joyeux de proclamer sa renommée par quatre bouches brillantes', but this abandons the syntactic parallel and makes no sense: gods do not proclaim their fame and that is certainly not the function of Sadāśiva's four lateral faces. On the other hand it is in keeping with Indic convention to say that the purpose of a religious installation is to enhance the founder's reputation (*kīrttiḥ, yaśaḥ*), that and the increase of merit (*puṇyam, dharmaḥ*) being everywhere identified as the goals of such activity, for the founder, others, usually his parents, or both. See K. 53, v. 12: *yo tiṣṭhipad imau devau śraddhayā bhūridakṣiṇau kīrttistambhāv ivodagrau* 'who installed these two gods with faith like two loft pillars of [his] fame, giving abundant fees'; K. 528, v. 202cd: *sthāpayām āsa pitṛṇāṃ dharmavrddhaye* 'he established [it] to augment the merit of his ancestors'; K. 323, v. 59ab: *imās svaśilparacitā gurūṇāṃ puṇyavrddhaye* 'these [images] fashioned by his own craft to increase the merit of his elders'; K. 339, v. 39: *khātam idaṃ mātuḥ taṭākaṃ puṇyavrddhaye* 'this tank was excavated to increase the merit of his mother'; Lājimpāṭ inscription of Mānadeva (467/8 A.D.) (Dh. VAJRĀCĀRYA 1973, No. 4): *mātuḥ ...sarvadā puṇyavrddhyai* 'for ever to increase the merit of his mother'; Varāhamihira (6th century), *Bṛhatsaṃhitā* 55.1cd: *devatāyatanaṃ kuryād yaśodharmābhivrddhaye* 'he should construct a temple to increase his fame and merit'; Bānskherā copper-plate inscription of Harṣa (628 A.D.), *EI* 4, pp. 210 ff., line 11 and the Sunak grant of Karṇa I (1091), *EI* I, 36, line 8 (prose): *puṇyayaśobhivrddhaye* 'to increase his fame and merit'; Ujjain copper-plate of Bhojadeva (*Indian Antiquary* 6, pp. 53 ff.): *mātāpitror ātmanaś ca puṇyayaśobhivrddhaye* 'to increase the merit and fame of his parents and himself'.

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

'national' Śivas in the Indian subcontinent. In the Tamil country Naṭarāja of Cidambaram became the family deity of the Cola emperors;[253] Paśupati in the Kathmandu valley is regularly invoked as the patron of the kings of that region from the seventh century to the present;[254] and the Gaṅgas who conquered Orissa claimed the same relationship with Śiva Gokarṇasvāmin on Mt. Mahendra in the Ganjam district, as did the Solaṅkis with Umāpatiśiva, the Hoysala Yādavas with Vajreśvaraśiva,[255] and the Guhilot kings of Mewār with Ekaliṅgaśiva.[256] The Rājendrabhadreśvara of the Pre Rup pyramid-temple was evidently intended as a local double of the national deity, permanently accessible to the monarch at the heart of the new capital and no doubt visible from his palace (*rājamandiram*). No remains of this palace have yet been identified, perhaps because they have not been searched for with sufficient diligence. But JACQUES has proposed that in accordance with normal practice it would have been located directly to the north of the Rājendrabhadreśvara temple, between it and the Yaśodharataṭāka and in alignment with both the Rājendrabhadreśvara and Rājendreśvara on the island at its centre.[257]

The role of Bhadreśvara as the sustainer of the king and his realm is confirmed by another passage of the same inscription:

kamvuviśvambharāyāṃ yas tridaśānāṃ svayambhuvām
sthāpitānāñ ca yajvaiko bhūtvā pūjām avarddhayat

rājendunā yena yathā yathā śrī-
bhadreśvare dīyata maṇḍalaśrīḥ
tathā tathāvarddhata niṣkalaṅkā
candraśriyaṃ hrepayituṃ mudeva
K. 806, vv. 270–271

Having become [as king] the unique worshipper of [all] the gods of Kambujadeśa, both the self-manifested and those installed, [Rājendravarman] increased their endowments.

253. *SII* 5:458: *taṃ kulanāyakam*; HALL 2001, 87–95.

254. The constant epithet of the kings of the Kathmandu valley in their inscriptions of the seventh and eighth centuries, beginning in the time of Aṃśuvarman (d. 639/40), is *bhagavatpaśupatibhaṭṭāraka–pādānugrhītaḥ / -pādānudhyātaḥ* 'favoured by the feet of Lord Paśupatibhaṭṭāraka' (see Dh. VAJRĀCĀRYA 1973, Nos. 71 and 72). Similarly in the epigraphy of Malla times the standard epithet of the kings of the region begins *paśupaticaraṇakamaladhūlidhūsaritaśiroruha-* 'with their hair made grey with the pollen of the lotuses that are the feet of Glorious Paśupati' (e.g., G. VAJRĀCĀRYA 1976, No. 12 of 761, = 1640/1 A.D.); and later, under the Shah dynasty, Nepalese inscriptions pray that this lineage may endure by the favour of the dust of the feet of Guhyakālī and Paśupati (e.g. G. VAJRĀCĀRYA 1976, No. 74, ll. 18–19: *yāvan nakṣatramālā vilasati gagane tāvad eva sthiraḥ syāt / pṛthvīnārāyaṇasya kṣitipatimukuṭaprotahīrasya vaṃśo nepāle guhyakālīpaśupaticaraṇadvandvadhūlīprasādāt. śubham astu. śrīśrīśrīpaśupataye namaḥ*).

255. See, e.g., SIRCAR 1983, 170 (Gaṅga): *gokarṇṇasvāminas samārādhanaladbhanikhilamanorathānām* 'who have obtained all their desires by propitiating the Lord Gokarṇa'; *EI* 27 (1956): 41, concerning Gaṅga Samantavarman: *mmahendrācalaśikharavaranivāsino gokarṇṇasvāminaḥ satata-praṇāmaparicaryyādibhiḥ rmm[rdhau]takāleyadoṣo* (lines 1–5) 'who has eliminated the sins of the Kali age by his constant obeisance, worship and [donations?] to the lord Gokarṇa who dwells on the summit of Mt. Mahendra'; SIRCAR 1983, p. 404 (Solaṅkī): *śrī-umāpativaralabdhaprauḍhapratāpa-* 'whose great might was obtained as a boon from Umāpatīśvara'; p. 544 (Hoysala Yādava): *vajreśvarārādhana-labdharājyaḥ* 'who obtained his realm by propitiating Vajreśvara'.

256. See James TOD (1829 and 1832) 1920, 1:222–225, 516. He reports that the Guhilot kings were seen as the regents of this Śiva (*ekliṅ kā dīwān*), Ekaliṅgaśiva himself being seen not only as their tutelary deity but also as the true ruler of the realm.

257. JACQUES 1999, 71 (map of Angkor), 72.

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

> [And] the more this moon among kings gifted the untainted wealth of his realm to Bhadreśvara the greater it grew, as though it sought through joy to shame the splendour of the moon itself.

The special status of this Śiva is also indicated by the fact that he was believed to have manifested a double of himself (*punarbhāva*) at Śikhareśvara/Śikharīśvara (Preah Vihear):

> *man [kamra]teṅ jagat śrībhadreśvara liṅgapura mok punarbhāva āy śrīśikharīśvara piy gi vraḥ tejaḥ ta yal pratyakṣa prādurbhāva*
> K. 380 E, ll. 3–5

> Then the Lord of the World Bhadreśvara of Liṅgapura came to be born a second time in Śikharīśvara, so that the divine radiance (*vraḥ tejaḥ*) should be made manifest [there].

and to have been induced to do so by king Sūryavarman I (r. 1002–*c.* 1050) as the reward of his ascetic practice (*tapovīryya*):

> *man kamrateṅ jagat śrībhadreśvara liṅgapura ti vraḥ pāda kamrateṅ kaṃtvan aṅ śrīsūryyavarmmadeva sādhya nu tapovīryya gi pi mok rājya āy śrīśikharīśvara piy gi vraḥ tejaḥ prādurbhāva pratyakṣa pi loka mel*
> K. 380 E, ll. 58–60

> Then the Lord of the World Śrībhadreśvara of Liṅgapura, by the power of asceticism achieved by His Majesty Sūryavarman [I], came to rule in Śikharīśvara, to make his divine radiance (*vraḥ tejaḥ*) visible, so that all the world could see it.

This public manifestation of Śiva's radiance was the installation of a Liṅga, as is revealed by parallel expressions.[258] The meaning, then, is that Sūryavarman I engaged in ascetic practices, probably in the vicinity of Bhadreśvara, and was rewarded with a vision in which that god had instructed him to install a double (*punarbhāva*) in the form of a Liṅga bearing this name at Preah Vihear. It is at least probable that this event was intended to be understood as a divine authorization of the king's rule, which we know to have been won by force of arms and after a long struggle. The theme of ascetic retreat from the world as enabling the seizing of power through conquest and as the support of its exercise is well-documented in Southeast Asian sources, among the Khmers, the Chams, and the Javanese;[259] and Preah Vihear was a site of special significance to this king's rule. It was

258. K. 769 (12th/13th century): *tejaś śaivam atiṣṭhipat* 'he installed the radiance of Śiva'; K. 232, v. 2cd: *jyotis tad uccaiś śaśiśekharasya liṅgībhavad *bhātu* (conj. : *bhāti* Ed.) *vibhūtikṛd vaḥ* 'May that intense light of Śiva taking the form of the Liṅga shine forth to bring you glory'; K. 834, v. 5: *namo stu śivaliṅgāya yadādijyotir aiśvaram niśśreyasābhyudayayos siddhyai dhātrādisādhitam* 'Let there be obeisance to the Liṅga of Śiva, *whose primal divine radiance (or: 'which, being the primal radiance of God' [*yad ādijyotir aiśvaram*]) was propitiated by Brahmā and the other [gods] as the means of accomplishing both salvation and prosperity'; K. 380 W, Khmer A, ll. 14–15: *nu man udyoga cāṃ pāñjīy kāla vraḥ śivatejaḥ kamrateṅ jagat śrīśikharīśvara ta yal pratyakṣa prādurbhāva* 'He carefully preserves the inventory [of goods received] since the time that the divine Śiva radiance of the Lord of the World Śikharīśvara was directly manifested to our senses'.

259. K. 323, v. 26 (eulogy of Yaśovarman I): *śaminā yena guptāpi kṛtye śaktiḥ prakāśitā / tāpasābhena hariṇā nakhālīva guhāṅkasā* 'Practising withdrawal in the guise of an ascetic living in a cave he manifested the power to act that had been concealed [within him], just as Hari [Narasiṃha] manifested his claws [when he appeared from the pillar to rend the impious Titan Hiraṇyakaśipu]'; K. 79, v. 1 (eulogy of Bhavavarman II): *rājā śrībhavavarmmeti tapasā dhāraṇād iti* (conj. : *dhāraṇāddhitiḥ* Ep. : *dhāraṇāditiḥ* corr. CŒDÈS) 'called Bhavavarman ['Protector of the World'] because he supported [it] through his ascetic practice'; K. 806, v. 289 (Rājendravarman addressing all the future kings of the Khmers): *labdhā dharitrī tapasā bhavadbhir* 'you have obtained the earth [to rule] by virtue of your

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

the northern of four sites around the limits of his kingdom at which he chose to establish Liṅgas incorporating his name (Sūryavarmeśvaras) in A.D. 1018;[260] it may well have been where he was first consecrated;[261] and it was the principal of three sites at which the written records of the reigns of his royal ancestors and the various departments of their governments were preserved during his reign.[262]

---

asceticism'. This theme is seen among the Chams in C. 66 = M. 31, the Dông Duong stele of Indravarman II (A.D. 875), A, vv. 18–21. There we are told the following. Bhadravarman's son Śrī-Indravarma now rules (*nṛpo bhavati*) in the royal city of Campā (*campānagare*), through the might of Śiva (*māheśvaraprabhāvāt*) (18). The perfect sovereignty that the king has acquired is not simply an inheritance from his ancestors (19ab), the gift of his grandfather to his father and of his father to him (19cd). He has won it from Bhadreśvara as the exceptional award of his religious austerities (*tapaḥphalaviśeṣāt*) [in many former lives (cf. prose after v. 37)], his pious actions, his wisdom and his valour (*puṇyabuddhiparākramāt*) (20–21). In Java we find the theme that the ideal king's career comprises ascetic preparation, victory through war and eventual retirement into life as a hermit. This pattern is ascribed to Pikatan, the Śaiva king of the Sañjaya dynasty in Central Java who expelled the Śailendras from Java in the mid-ninth century, and to the East Javanese conqueror Airlangga (r. 1019–1049) (TAYLOR 1992, 177–178). The latter is said to have spent four years in a hermitage on the mountain Vanagiri before he acceded to the pleas of the brahmaṇs and other dignitaries that he should accept royal power (CŒDÈS 1968, 144–145). It is very probable that it was the latter's career that motivated his court poet Mpu Kaṇva to compose his *Arjunawiwāha* (A.D. 1053), since that retells the myth derived from the *Mahābhārata* of the asceticism undertaken by Arjuna on the Indrakīla mountain to obtain from Śiva the weapon that would bestow victory on the humiliated Pāṇḍavas (HENRY 1986, 14, following BERG). The theme persisted after the arrival of Islam, being found in the Javanese chronicles (*babad*). SUPOMO (1997, I:67), writes: "we often read in various *babad*, that a would-be rebel against a Javanese king, Dutch authority, or both, would invariably practice asceticism before embarking on his dangerous undertaking".

260. The others were at Jayakṣetra (= Vat Baset in Battambang) in the west, Sūryādri (= Phnom Chisor) in the south, and Īśānatīrtha, presumably in the east. JACQUES proposes (1999, 96–99) that it may have been by the Mekong river. Perhaps it was within the territory of the old kingdom of Īśānapura in the Sen river valley to the east of the Tonlé Sap. The installation of these four Sūryavarmeśvaras is recorded in K. 380 E, v. 12: *ekaṃ śrīśikhareśvarādriśikhare śrīśānatīrthe para[m] śrīsūryyādriśiloccaye nyad asame śrīsūryyavarmmeśvaram / liṅgaṃ samyag asau śriyādhikajayakṣetre purātiṣṭhipat paścāt tūrṇaviyatpayodhivivaraiś śrīsūryyavarmmā triṣu* 'Sūryavarman first installed a Sūryavarmeśvaraliṅga in Śrījayakṣetra and then, in 940 elapsed, in three [other sites], one on the summit of the hill of Śikhareśvara, another at Īśānatīrtha, and yet another on the summit of the hill of the Sun (Sūryādri)'.

261. This hypothesis has been proposed by JACQUES (1976b, 364).

262. K. 380 W of 1037/8 A.D., Khmer, ll. 11–26: *959 śaka amāvasyā māgha ta jā puṣya dhaniṣṭhanakṣatra madhyāha nu vraḥ kamrateṅ añ śrīrājapativarmma cau vraḥ kamrateṅ añ śrīrājapativarmma ta qcās sruk avadhyapura paṅgaṃ thpvaṅ nivedana ta vraḥ pāda kamrateṅ kaṃtvan añ śrīsūryyavarmmadeva ruv gi bhaktiy śrīsukarmmā kaṃsteṅ nā man jā tem ta gi karmma durggama phoṅ nā kamrateṅ jagat śrīśikharīśvara nu kamrateṅ jagat śrīvrddheśvara nu man udyoga cāṃ pāñjīy kāla vraḥ śivatejaḥ kamrateṅ jagat śrīśikharīśvara ta yal pratyakṣa prādurbhāva ta nu jā vraḥ yaśasthirāvasāna nu man gi ta mān santāna ta cāṃ likhita kamvuvaṅśa nu aṅga vraḥ rājakāryya likhita kīrtti kamrateṅ phdai karoṃ daṃnepra gi vraḥ pāda śrutavarmmadeva lvoḥ ta vraḥ kīrtti vraḥ pāda kamrateṅ kaṃtvan añ śrīsūryyavarmmadeva ta rājakula vraḥ pāda kamrateṅ añ śrīndravarmmadeva ta stac dau īśvaraloka nu kaṃmrateṅ añ śrīvīralakṣmī mahādevī āy vrac vraḥ sruk rājakula vraḥ pāda śrīharṣavarmmadeva ta stac dau rudraloka nu vraḥ pāda śrīśānavarmmadeva ta stac dau paramarudraloka nu man gi ta laṃtāp vraḥ likhita pi duk ta vraḥ rikta pi duk nā kamrateṅ jagat śrīśikharīśvara nu kamrateṅ jagat śrīvrddheśvara nu ta ti duk āy kanloṅ nu man śapata teṃ bhaktiy mvāy vaddha nu vraḥ kamrateṅ añ śrīrājapativarmma gi pi vraḥ pāda kamrateṅ kaṃtvan añ śrīsūryyavarmmadeva karuṇā pandval vraḥ vara ta śrīsukarmmā kaṃsteṅi oy prasāda rājadravya nu sruk vibheda mrtakadhana mratāñ śrīpṛthivīnarendra kaṃnuṅ (kaṃn[u]ṅ) kaṃsteṅ śrīmahīdharavarmma vraḥ sruk ta śrīsukarmmā kaṃsteṅi pandval pre cā ta vraḥ śilāstambha nā kamrateṅ jagat śrīśikharīśvara pre cār ta śilāprasasta pi duk ta sruk vibheda mna vraḥ pāda kamrateṅ kaṃtvan añ śrīsūryya[varmma]deva oy vraḥ karuṇā prasāda ta śrīsukarmmā kaṃsteṅi nu kulasantāna śrīsukarmmā*

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

The pre-eminence of Bhadreśvara as the principal Śiva of the realm is also seen in references to a practice in which the king's Guru, after consecrating him as the monarch, would receive lavish gifts from him and then go on a pilgrimage to sacred sites (*kṣetrādhigama*) to pass on those gifts as his own donations to the deities of those sites, to perform sacrifices there, install images, found hermitages, excavate reservoirs and establish endowments. Divākarapaṇḍita, after serving in lesser capacities under Udayādityavarman II (r. 1050–1066) and Harṣavarman III (r. 1066–1080), is said to have followed this practice as Vraḥ Guru under Jayavarman VI (r. 1080–1107), Dharaṇīndravarman I (r. 1107–1112) and Sūryavarman II (r. 1113–*c.* 1150). We are told that after he had performed the royal consecration of Sūryavarman II, given him Śaiva initiation, taught him the Śaiva scriptures and other branches of learning, and been invited to perform the Koṭihoma and other annual brahmanical sacrifices for him, he was given golden palanquins and many other valuables so that he could visit various sacred sites around the kingdom and give these to the deities installed there, each engraved with a verse composed by the king himself to the effect that it was a gift to Śiva made by his revered Guru. The sites chosen for this purpose were five, of which the first three are clearly the most important: Bhadreśvara, Śikharīśvara (Preah Vihear), and Śivapura Danden (Phnom Sandak). At each of these he had a water-reservoir excavated, founded a hermitage, gave it slaves and villages and made an endowment to provide for worship. Similarly, Sadāśiva Jayendrapaṇḍita, high priest of the royal Śaiva cult of the Kamrateṅ Jagat ta Rāja (Devarāja) and Guru of Udayādityavarman II, is praised for his constant lavish donations to 'Bhadreśvara and other gods'.[263]

---

kaṃsteṅi ta ti duk ta sruk vibheda ta jmaḥ kurukṣetra īlī 'In 958 Śaka, on the new moon day of Māgha in Puṣya, under the asterism Dhaniṣṭhā, at midday. V.K.A. Śrī Rājapativarman, grandson of V.K.A. Śrī Rājapativarman the elder, of Sruk Avadhyapura, respectfully informs H.H. Sūryavarman [I] of the works of devotion of Śrī Sukarmā Kaṃsteṅ on the occasion of the beginning of the works of fortification for the gods Śikharīśvara and Vṛddheśvara. He preserves with great effort the inventory [of goods received] since the time that the Śiva splendour of Śikharīśvara was directly manifested to our senses ...There is a family that preserves the records of the Kambu lineage and the departments of the royal service, records of the splendid deeds of the kings from [those of] Śrutavarman down to those of Sūryavarman I in the royal family of Indravarman who went to Īśvaraloka and [down to those of] the queen Vīralakṣmī Mahādevī of Vrac of the Vraḥ Sruk, relative of Harṣavarman who went to Rudraloka and of Īśānavarman who went to Paramarudraloka. The collection of the sacred records is kept on leaves stored in Śikharīśvara, Vṛddheśvara and Kanloṅ. He took the same oath of loyalty *following the same formula as Rājapativarman (?). So Sūryavarman I favoured Sukarmā and gave him royal goods and the Sruk Vibheda, inheritance of Pṛthivīnarendra being part of the goods of Mahīdharavarman of Vraḥ Sruk. He ordered that [this decision] be engraved on a stone pillar in Śikharīśvara and ordered it to be engraved on [another] stone pillar to be placed in the Sruk Vibheda given by him to Sukarmā in Sruk Vibheda, formerly called Kurukṣetra'.

263. The account of Divākarapaṇḍita's offices and donations is given in K. 194, A9–B17. The gifts of Sadāśiva Jayendrapaṇḍita are mentioned in K. 235, v. 119ab: *maṇikanakamayādi dyumnajātaṃ vadanyas satatam adita deve bhūri bhadreśvarādau* 'A liberal donor, he constantly gave valuables made of jewels, gold and other [precious substances] in great abundance to Bhadreśvara and the other deities'. CŒDÈS and DUPONT (1943–46: 137–139) discuss this practice of redistributing royal gifts to the gods of the kingdom in the introduction to their edition of this inscription, considering both these passages. They also cite the case of the general Saṃgrāma. K. 289 D recounts his campaign against a chieftain called Slvat, who had attacked him in Pṛthuśaila. He defeated him at Praśānvraimmyat and founded two hermitages dedicated to Śiva Bhadreśvara at the site in this same year, giving one thousand cows and a hundred and twenty cows. The inscription records a further encounter near a temple of Viṣṇu. Once again victorious he made donations to this god and having returned handed over the booty (*dhanāni hṛtāni*) to the king, Udayādityavarman II. The king gave these riches back to the general as the reward of his loyal service. The general declined to accept them and asked that they be given to the king's subtle inner self,

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

Neither Buddhism nor Vaiṣṇavism offered the Khmers any deity so central to their collective identity and only Śaivism had inscribed itself so deeply into the Khmers' sense of place, by establishing this and other doubles of the Śivas of ancient temple-sites of the Indian subcontinent and by locating natural, autochthonous Śivas in their landscape.

Śaivism and Khmer Vaiṣṇavism

Moreover, while Pāñcarātrika Vaiṣṇavism and Mahāyāna Buddhism flourished alongside Śaivism, there are indications they were unable to escape its shadow. Thus Nārāyaṇa, a Bhāgavata courtier of Jayavarman V (r. *c.* 970–1000), could found a Vaiṣṇava hermitage and build a Viṣṇu temple within it, but then install images of Nandin and Mahākāla to guard its entrance, although these two are the door-guardians prescribed in the Śaiva systems for shrines of Śiva.[264]

cakāra cakrisaubhaktyāt saṃkrāntapadam āśramam
dāsīdāsahiraṇyādidhanair āpūrayac ca saḥ
dviprasthañ cātra śucyannaṃ dātavyaṃ prativāsaram
triprasthadevayajñañ ca cakriṇe so py akalpayat
nandinaṃ śrīmahākālaṃ dvāsthaṃ viṣṇor vvidhāya saḥ
dviprastham anvahan tābhyāṃ yajñan deyam akalpayat
K. 256 C, v. 9–11 (= K. 814, v. 9–11)
9a *saubhaktyāt* conj. : *saubhaktyā* (*saubhāktyā* K. 814) Cœdès and Dupont[265] • 10a *dviprasthañ cātra śucyannaṃ* conj. : *dviprasthaṃ tadā śucyannaṃ* Cœdès and Dupont[266]

Out of his great devotion to Viṣṇu he founded the Saṃkrāntapada hermitage and filled it with male and female slaves, gold and other valuables. He provided for two prastha measures of pure food to be given here daily [for the residents] and for [daily] offerings of three prasthas to Viṣṇu. He also established a Nandin and a Mahākāla at the door of [this] Viṣṇu [temple] and provided for a daily offering of two prasthas to be given to them.[267]

---

the Śiva in the golden Liṅga (v. 27bc: *suvarṇṇamayaliṅgagateśvare te sūkṣmāntarātmani*), which was probably that which Ṇdayādityavarman II had established *c.* 1060 on the Tribhuvanacūḍāmaṇigiri (the Baphuon temple-mountain) (see K. 136 B, v. 24).

264. See *Pañcārthabhāṣya* ad *Pāśupatasūtra* 1.9; *Somaśambhupaddhati* 1:95; *Sūryasevana* p. 135; *Svacchanda* 2.25 and *Netratantra* 3.9; Kṣemarāja ad *Svacchanda* 2.25 and *Netratantra* 3.9; and *Tantrāloka* 15.183–188b.

265. The emendation *saubhaktyāt* cannot be supported by any citation of this word; but it is well-formed as an abstract from *subhakta-* 'very devoted, very loyal' (cf. such words as *saugandhyam* and *saubhāgyam*), whereas *saubhaktyā*, which could only be understood to mean *subhaktyā*, is an implausible solecism.

266. The version of K. 814 is given by Cœdès and Dupont as *catuḥprastha – śucyannaṃ*, reporting that the syllable after *stha* is *cā* or *cchā* with *tra* written beneath. The reading *dviprasthaṃ tadā śucyannaṃ* accepted by Cœdès and Dupont in K. 256 C is unmetrical.

267. The word *śucyannam* 'pure food' is a Vaiṣṇava usage. In our Old Khmer inscriptions *śucyanna* and *saṃvibhāga* are in the worship of Viṣṇu what *caru* and *naivedya* are in that of Śiva and the Goddess. See K. 989 B, l. 47–C, l. 1. For this usage among Indian Vaiṣṇavas see *Rahasyāmnāya* cited and discussed by Vedāntadeśika in his *Saccaritrarakṣā*, p. 90, ll. 7–18; also Alaśiṅgabhaṭṭa ad *Sātvatasaṃhitā* 6.181c–182: ...*odanapacane śucyannaṃ śrapayitvā vedyāṃ bhagavate nayati* ....

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

The deities required at the entrance to a Vaiṣṇava shrine are Caṇḍa and Pracaṇḍa.[268]

There is further evidence of the intrusion of Śaivism into the Vaiṣṇavism of the Khmers if the great temple established by Sūryavarman II (r. 1113–*c.* 1150) and now known as Angkor Vat was originally dedicated to Viṣṇu, as is probable and generally accepted. In the bas-relief on the wall of the eastern section of its southern gallery thirty-two hells are depicted, each with an accompanying Khmer legend that names it and identifies the kinds of sinners being punished in it.[269] Now the schema of thirty-two hells is distinctively Śaiva. It is taught in the Śaiva scriptures *Niśvāsamukha*, *Mataṅga* (VP 23.74–81b), *Parākhya* (5.11–32b), and *Kiraṇa* (*Vidyāpāda* 8.7–11c). There is some small variation among these sources in the names or identities of the hells, and no scriptural list known to me agrees exactly with that of the Angkor Vat bas-relief. But there is a particularly close agreement, both in names and in their order, with that of the *Niśvāsamukha*.[270] In any case all the Śaiva lists are closer to that of Angkor Vat than are those seen in brahmanical and Vaiṣṇava sources.[271]

But more telling than this is the fact that the inscriptions identifying the categories of sinners who are punished in these hells disclose an unambiguously Śaiva perspective. For they include persons who have committed offences against Śiva or his devotees but none who have committed sins against Viṣṇu or Vaiṣṇavas.[272] Thus:

> *kriminicaya. anak ta nindā devatā vraḥ vleṅ. guru. vrāhmaṇa. mahājñāna. anak ta pradau dharmma. anak ta śivabhakti. ame. vapā. suhṛt.*
> K. 299, no. 6[273]

> Kriminicaya: [Here are] those who denigrate the gods, the sacred fire, a Guru, a brahmin of great knowledge, a teacher of religious duty, devotees of Śiva, their mother, father or friends.

268. These, and, in subordinate roles, Jaya and Vijaya, Śaṅkhanidhi and Cakranidhi are prescribed in *Jayākhyasaṃhitā* 13.79–81; *Lakṣmītantra* 33.49–60; *Pādmasaṃhitā* 2.48; 4.17; 10.63–66.

269. K. 299 (*NIC* II–III, 156–163). The hells are the following: 1 Avīci, 2 Kriminicaya, 3 the river Vaitaraṇī, 4 Kūṭaśalmalī, 5 Yugmaparvata, 6 Nirucchvāsa, 7 Ucchvāsa, 8 Dravattrapu, 9 Taptalākṣāmaya, 10 Asthibhaṅga, 11 *Krakaccheda (corr. : *krakaccheda* Ed.), 12 Pūyapūrṇahrada, 13 Asṛkpūrṇahrada, 14 Medohrada, 15 Tīkṣṇāyastunda, 16 Aṅgāranicaya, 17 Ambarīṣa, 18 Kumbhīpāka, 19 Tālavṛkṣavana, 20 Kṣuradhāraparvata, 21 S - - - - - - , 22 Sūcimukha, 23 Kālasūtra, 24 Mahāpadma, 25 Padma, 26 Sañjīvana, 27 [Sujīvana], 28 [Uṣṇa], 29 Śīta, 30 Sāndratamas, 31 Mahāraurava, and 32 Raurava.

270. *Niśvāsamukha*, f. 17v6–18r1: *avīcī krminicayo vaitaraṇī kūṭaśālmalī / giriyamala ucchvāso nirucchvāso hy athāparaḥ / pūtimānsa dravaś caiva trapus taptajatus tathā / paṅkālayo 'sthibhaṅgaś ca krakaccheddam eva ca / medosṛkpūyahradaś ca tīkṣṇāyastuṇḍam eva ca / aṅgārarāśibhuvanaḥ śakuniḥ khañjarīṭakaḥ / ⏑ ⏑ ⏑ ⏑ ⏑ – – ⏑ hy asitālavanas tathā / sūcīmukhaḥ kṣuradhāraḥ kālasūtro 'siparvataḥ / padmaś caiva samākhyato mahāpadmas tathaiva ca / †ayoko+ra† uṣṇaś ca sañjīvanasujīvanau / śītatamondhatamasau mahārauravarauravau / dvātriṃśad ete narakā mayā devi prakīrttitāḥ.*

271. See, e.g., *Manusmṛti* 4.88–90, *Viṣṇudharma* 45.9–12, *Brahmapurāṇa* 215.84–135, *Agnipurāṇa* 203.6–23.

272. This incongruity was considered in a study of these bas-reliefs by CŒDÈS (1911, 210). He considered that it did not contradict the exclusively Vaiṣṇava character of the bas-reliefs of Angkor Vat, on the ground that the inscriptions might be a little later than the bas-reliefs and that they may therefore have been executed after the fashion for Vaiṣṇavism had receded in favour of Śaivism, the persistent primary religion. This hypothesis is weakened by the fact that, as we have seen, the bas-reliefs of the hells are themselves Śaiva in inspiration. CŒDÈS wrongly thought the inspiration to be Buddhist (1911, 207–8).

273. These inscriptions were published by AYMONIER (1883), then, with some corrections of Aymonier's readings by CŒDÈS (1911). They have now been re-edited by POU (2001, 156–163) with notes and some unremarked deviations from the text of CŒDÈS. The text given here and the following citation is that of CŒDÈS and POU.

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

and:

padma. anak ta lvac vṅya. peḥ vṅya ta śivārāma. duk jey sin.
K. 299, no. 29

Padma: [Here are] those who steal flowers, who pluck flowers from the garden of a Śiva [temple] (*śivārāma*), *and enjoy keeping them (*duk*) in their huts (*jey*) (?).

Indeed both these passages have striking Sanskrit parallels in the treatment of the candidates for infernal punishment given in the *Śivadharmottara*, one of the two principal Śaiva scriptures concerned with the duties of the uninitiated Śaiva laity. These are:

ye nindanti mahātmānam ācāryaṃ dharmadeśakam
śivabhaktāṃś ca saṃmūḍhāḥ śivadharmaṃ ca śāśvatam
f. 38r7–8, = 7.192c–193b

Those fools who denigrate a man of great wisdom, a Guru, a teacher of religious duty, devotees of Śiva and the eternal Śivadharma ... [274]

and:

ye śivārāmapuṣpāṇi lobhāt saṃgṛhya pāṇinā
jighranti mūḍhamanasaḥ śirasā dhārayanti ca
f. 38r6, = 7.190c–191b

Those of deluded mind who out of greed pluck flowers from the garden of a Śiva [temple], enjoy their fragrance, and wear them on their heads ....

In my translation of the last phrase of the second Khmer passage (*duk jey sin*) I have reproduced that given by the Khmerologist Saveros POU with her edition of the inscription. But I have queried it, because *jey* is not found in any other Old Khmer inscription, and the meaning 'hut' that POU attributes to it is both hypothetical and less than compelling in the context.[275] I propose that *jey* is an error for *thep* 'smell'. The characters *th-* and *j-* are similar enough in the Khmer script, as are *p-* and *y-*, to be easily confused; and the emendation replaces the puzzling reference to those who keep Śiva's flowers in their huts with exactly what we find in the Sanskrit parallel: 'those who wear them [on their heads] (*duk*) and those who smell [them] (*thep*)'. Only the order of the two is different.[276]

274. The Khmer text suggests that it might be based on a variant of this verse with the reading *mahājñānam* rather than *mahātmānam*. The meaning is any case the same.

275. See POU 1992, 191ab and 545b (s.v. *hajaya*). Her evidence for this meaning is the hapax legomenon *hajaya* K. 324a (*NIC* II–III, 62–64), l. 36 (9th century): *emāṃ hajaya tai kanlak* 'Guard of the *hajaya*: the female servant Kanlak', and Middle and Modern Khmer *jai*. See also POU 2001, 163 (ad loc.). But only the meaning of *jai* would seem to be certain. CŒDÈS (1911, 207) saw no meaning in *duk jey sin* and so attempted no translation.

276. The point of the rule against smelling the flowers for worship, that is to say, deliberately inhaling their fragrance, is that having been enjoyed by another they become impure and therefore unfit to be offered to the deity. See, e.g., *Paramasaṃhitā* 5.29cd: *anyair anupayogas tu sarveṣāṃ śuddhir uttamā* 'the highest purity is not to have been used by others'; 5.46c–47b: *bhuktaśeṣaṃ parimlānam asprśyasprṣṭam eva ca // puṣpaṃ vihitam-apy etam āpatkāle 'pi varjayet* 'He should avoid these flowers though enjoined [for offering] if they have been already enjoyed, if they are faded and if they have been touched by an untouchable, even in times of dire distress'.

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

Śaivism and Khmer Buddhism

As for Mahāyāna Buddhism, whose presence among the Khmers is apparent from the seventh century onwards in images of the Bodhisattva Avalokiteśvara, that too received extensive patronage from the Khmer élite,[277] particularly during the reigns of Jayavarman V (*c.* 970–1000) and Jayavarman VII (1181–*c.* 1210), both of whom, but especially the latter, were active supporters and adherents of this form of Buddhism. Indeed Jayavarman VII's vast and grandiose program of Buddhist temple and monastery building was evidently part of a conscious attempt to supplant Śaivism as the dominant religion, empowering it to take over the roles of protecting the state, validating its hierarchies and sanctioning the authority of the emperor.

The Mahāyāna was already well placed to do this, especially since it had provided itself through the Way of Mantras (*mantranayaḥ*, *mantrayānam*) with an elaborate and impressive system of rituals designed along Śaiva lines to offer its royal patrons exactly the protective and apotropaic benefits promised by their rivals. However, the Mahāyānist versatility of method (*upāyakauśalam*) that enabled this development went a step further among the Khmers. For they adopted the Śaiva practice of installing deities under names that incorporate that of the founder. Moreover, in the case of Lokeśvara, these names end in -īśvara, as do those of Śiva-images. Indeed in one case such a Lokeśvara is even referred to as a Liṅga, a surprising inroad from Śaiva terminology, in which *liṅgam* denotes all three varieties of Śiva image, namely the Liṅga proper (*avyaktaṃ liṅgam*,

277. For seventh- and eighth-century images of two-armed Avalokiteśvara see JESSUP and ZÉPHIR 1997, nos. 7–10. Images of the four-armed and eight-armed Avalokiteśvara generally called Lokeśvara in the inscriptions abound in the Angkorean period; see ibid., nos. 59, 95–98. The earliest epigraphic reference to Lokeśvara is K. 244 of A.D. 791/2: *samaguṇaśaśinagaśāke prathito yas supratiṣṭhito bhagavān / jagadīśvara iti nāmnā sa jayati lokeśvarapratimaḥ* 'Victorious is the renowned Lord well installed in Śāka 713 under the name Jagadīśvara in the likeness of Lokeśvara'. Inscriptions record many installations of Lokeśvara, the Buddha, and the goddess Prajñāpāramitā, the Perfection of Wisdom who is the Mother of the Buddhas (*jinamātā* K. 273, v. 36; *jinānāṃ jananī* K. 273, v. 5); and there is material and epigraphic evidence of the currency of the worship of those three as a triad on a single base, a meditating Buddha seated on the coils of the Nāga Mucilinda being flanked by attendant standing figures of the other two: see, e.g., JESSUP and ZÉPHIR 1997, no. 95. We also find a tetrad comprising these and Vajrin (= Vajrapāṇi, the wrathful defender of the faith): see ibid., no. 59, where they appear on the four sides of a small Caitya. The cult of Ekādaśamukha, the eleven-faced Avalokiteśvara, was also present. K. 168 of A.D. 973 records gifts of slaves and other valuables to Ekādaśamukha, Lokeśvara and Bhagavatī (Prajñāpāramitā). The popularity of this cult in the early phase of the development of the Mantranaya within Mahāyāna is shown not only by the survival of its principal scriptural authority, the *Ekādaśamukhadhāraṇī*, among the sixth-to seventh century manuscripts of the Gilgit horde (ed. DUTT 1939, 35–40), but also by the existence of three Chinese versions (Taishō 1070, translated by Yaśogupta around the middle of the sixth century, Taishō 1071, translated by Xuanzang in 656, and Taishō 1069, translated by Amoghavajra at some time between 720 and 774) and by its conspicuous role in the religious rituals of Japan during the eighth century (ABÉ 1999, 159–176). By the time of Jayavarman V, if not earlier, the more esoteric, Vairocana-centred Mantranaya of the Yogatantra that reached China in the eighth century and Japan in the ninth, was in vogue among the Khmers (K. 111, see below n. 284; K. 240–241, which refers to a donation to the deity Trailokyavijaya (l. 2), for whose position in the Buddhist Yogatantra tradition see LINROTHE 1999, 26, 178–211, 214–215); and by the late twelfth century the cult of Hevajra, a major deity of the Buddhist Yoginītantras that followed the phase of the Yogatantras in India, was flourishing there, as can be seen by many surviving images (LOBO 1997; JESSUP and ZÉPHIR 1997, nos. 99–102), though by no epigraphic reports.

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

niṣkalaṃ liṅgam), the anthropomorphic image (*sakalaṃ liṅgam*), and the hybrid Liṅga with Śiva's faces (*vyaktāvyaktaṃ liṅgam, sakalaniṣkalaṃ liṅgam*).[278]

Jayavarman VII adopted this practice of installing deities incorporating his name, evidently for the glorification of himself and his lineage, in his two vast foundations at Angkor, the Rājavihāra (Ta Prohm) and the Jayaśrīnagarī (Preah Khan). In 1186/7 he had an image of Prajñāpāramitā with the likeness and name of his devout Buddhist mother Jayarājacūḍāmaṇi installed as the presiding deity of the former,[279] and in 1191/2 he had a Lokeśvara embodying his father installed with his own name (Jayavarmeśvara) as the presiding deity of the latter.[280]

He also installed Jayabuddhamahānāthas, images of the Buddha incorporating his name, in many sites throughout his realm[281] and ordained that every year during the month of Phālguna these should be invited to the temple of the Lokeśvara Jayavarmeśvara, together with the "Eastern Buddha", the Buddha Vīraśakti (*vīrasaktisugataḥ*),[282] the Buddha of Phimai (*vimāyasugataḥ*), the Prajñāpāramitā Jayarājacūḍāmaṇi of the Rājavihāra, and Bhadreśvara, Cāmpeśvara, Pṛthuśaileśvara and the other major deities of the realm, in all one hundred and twenty-two.[283] This must have

278. The Sanskrit portion of K. 239 records the installation in A.D. 961/2 of a – – ∪ – *keśvaraliṅgam ...prāsādam* (S. l. 13. v. 7) by Bhadrātiśaya, a servant of King Rājendravarman. The text begins with obeisance to the Three Jewels and the donor prays that the merit of the act should go to his mother. father. the king, [his] guru, his kinsman and his friend, and that by means of this good deed he may be a Bodhisattva in life after life in order to save people drowning in the ocean of incarnation. The Khmer portion of the inscription records the consecration in A.D. 966 of bricks offered to V.K.A. śrī Jagannāthakeśvara (l. 23) and donations to him of various paddy-fields. This deity is surely the same as that of the – – ∪ – *keśvaraliṅgam ...prāsādaṃ* of the Sanskrit text, though the metre precludes exactly that name. Given the context and the name in -īśvara it is highly probable that this deity was a Lokeśvara. We may compare the Lokeśvara Jagadīśvara of K. 244.

279. K. 273. v. 36–37: *prātiṣṭhipac chrījayarāja*cūḍāmaṇiṃ* (corr. : *cūddāmaṇiṃ* Ep.) *maṇidyotitapuṇyadehām / tasyāñ janaṇyā jinamātrmūrttiṃ mūrttiṃ samūrttidyuśaśāṅkarūpaiḥ / so tiṣṭhipac chrījayamaṅgalār[tha]devaṃ tathā śrījayakīrttidevam / mūrttiṃ guror dakṣiṇavāma – yaṣ ṣaṣṭiṃ śate dvau parivāradevān* 'In [Śāka] 1108 he installed Jayarājacūḍāmaṇi, an image of the Mother of the Buddhas. Its body was illuminated by its jewels and it incorporated his mother. He installed a Jayamaṅgalārthadeva and a Jayakīrtideva. embodying his Guru, to its left and right, and two hundred and sixty deities as its retinue'.

280. K. 908. v. 34–35: *sa śrījayavarmmanṛpaś śrījayavarmmeśvarākhyalokeśam / vedendu-candrarūpair udamīlayad atra pitṛmūrttim / āryāvalokiteśasya madhyamasya samantataḥ / śatadvayan trayośītis tena devāḥ pratiṣṭhitāḥ* 'In [Śāka] 1113 that king Jayavarman [VII] installed here a Lokeśa called Jayavarmeśvara embodying his father. Two hundred and eighty-three deities were installed around this central Avalokiteśvara'.

281. K. 908. v. 115–121b. This says that Jayavarman installed a Jayabuddhamahānātha at each of twenty-three listed locations (120c–121b: *trayoviṃśati*deśeṣv* [em. : *deveṣv* CŒDÈS] *eṣv ekaikasmiṃn atiṣṭhipat / jayavuddhamahānāthaṃ śrīmantaṃ so vanīpatiḥ*). But in v. 159 it speaks of the Jayabuddhamahānāthas of the twenty-five locations (*jayavuddhamahānāthāḥ pañcaviṃśatideśakāḥ*).

282. This Buddha is probably the "god Vīraśakti" mentioned in Jayavarman's Rājavihāra foundation stele. K. 273. v. 85: *bhagavān bhagavatyāsau *caturddaśyāṃ* (corr. CŒDÈS : *caturddhaśyāṃ* Ep.) *pradakṣiṇam / triḥ kuryyāt *paurṇamāsyāñ* (corr. : *paurṇamāsyañ* CŒDÈS) *ca vīraśaktyādibhis suraiḥ* 'On the fourteenth [of Caitra] and on the full moon day the [Buddha] and the goddess [Prajñāpāramitā] should circumambulate [the temple] three times. keeping it on their right side. together with Vīraśakti and the other gods'. K. 240 N comprises the words *kamrateñ jagat śrī jayavīraśaktimahādeva*. This. given that it is found on a Buddhist temple. is no doubt the same deity rather than a Śiva (Mahādeva).

283. K. 908. v. 158–160: *atrādhyeṣyā ime devāḥ phālguṇe prativatsaram / prācyo munīndraś śrījayarājacūḍāmaṇis tathā / jayavuddhamahānāthāḥ pañcaviṃśatideśakāḥ / śrīvīraśaktisugato vimāyasugato pi ca / bhadreśvaracāmpeśvarapṛthuśaileśvarādayaḥ / śatadvāviṃśatiś caite piṇḍitāḥ*

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

entailed processions (*yātrā*) in which their festival images—we may presume that their primary images remained in place—were transported in palanquins (*śibikā*) over considerable distances into the presence of the king's personal Lokeśvara in the capital in a ceremony that mirrored that in which subordinate rulers would come before their overlord to demonstrate their dependence and loyalty.

The inscription that records these arrangements listed twenty-three sites throughout the kingdom in which Jayavarman VII established a Jayabuddhamahānātha. But when it speaks of the annual visit of these Buddhas to the temple of Lokeśvara Jayavarmeśvara it gives their number as twenty-five. Perhaps this is a lapse. But that would be surprising in an inscription that contains a great deal of precise numerical information on the funding of the foundation, the various classes of personnel engaged to serve in it, and its deities. I propose that the number has risen because the author's list was of provincial Jayabuddhamahānāthas and that there were two others in the capital or its vicinity that were to be included in the total in the context of the annual visit. It is probable that one of the additional two was the image presiding in the Bayon, the great temple constructed by Jayavarman VII at the centre of his ceremonial capital Angkor Thom. The broken fragments of a Buddha were found at the bottom of a deep shaft under the tower in which the image would have been housed, perhaps, as has often been suggested, having been thrown there during the anti-Buddhist Śaiva backlash after the end of this reign. That Jayavarman VII installed a Buddha here is in any case highly probable. The Bayon, the Jayaśrīnagarī and the Rājavihāra, his three principal Buddhist foundations, would thus have been dedicated to the Buddha, Lokeśvara, and Prajñāpāramitā respectively, completing the triad whose worship as a set, on a single base with the Buddha in the centre, is a well attested feature of Buddhist devotion during this period. That it should have been a personal Buddha is intrinsically probable in the light of his policy in his other foundations, and that it should have a personal Buddha in his own name is also probable, since that would have accomplished a further symmetry: his personal Buddha in the Bayon at the centre of Angkor Thom with a Lokeśvara and Prajñāpāramitā embodying his father and mother in Jayaśrīnagarī and the Rājavihāra outside its walls.

That this cult of the personal deity-image was adopted from Śaivism, and in Kambujadeśa itself, cannot be demonstrated conclusively. But it is very probable. It is less than certain because it rests on an inference from an absence of evidence that this practice was ever adopted by Buddhists in India together with the assumption that though the installation of deities incorporating the name of the founder was also practised in Pāñcarātrika Vaiṣṇavism, the preponderance of Śaivism in the religion of the Khmer state makes that an improbable source. My assertion that Buddhist images were not personalized in India through the incorporation of their founder's name is, of course, a claim that further research or the greater knowledge of others may easily refute, since even a single example of the practice would suffice for this purpose. But in this case the inference of absence from the absence of evidence is somewhat strengthened by the fact we find no evidence of the practice in a context in which we would expect to see evidence if it existed. This is the record of the religious foundations of pre-Islamic Kashmir in

---

parivārakaiḥ. K. 254 (Sanskrit, vv. 28–29; Khmer, B l. 44–d, l. 42) details benefactions in 1127 for the Śiva Liṅgapureśvara / Kaṃmrateṅ Jagat Liṅgapura, the Śiva of Prthuśaila (Phnom Roung, north of the Dang Raek range) / Kaṃmrateṅ Jagat Vnaṃ Ruṅ, the Viṣṇu of Cāmpeśvara / Vraḥ Kānti Kaṃmrateṅ Añ Śrīcāmpeśvara, and the Buddha of Vaṃśārāma / Kaṃmrateṅ Jagat Chpā Ransi. In K. 289, C, v. 32 the military commander Saṃgrāma makes donations to Prthuśailaśiva and requests him to grant him success in his campaign to seize the rebel Kaṃvau during the reign of Udayādityavarman II (1050–1066): *prthuśailaśivaṃ prāpya samyag ārādhya so dhiyā / datvā rairūpyanāgendrān arīndrāptim ayācata.*

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

Kalhaṇa's chronicle of the dynasties of that kingdom (*Rājataraṅgiṇī*), completed in A.D. 1149/50. In Kashmir, as in Kambujadeśa, Buddhism, Śaivism and the Pāñcarātra were able to flourish side by side. In nearly all the cases of Śaiva and Vaiṣṇava foundations established by the kingdom's rulers and high dignitaries the deity installed or the Maṭha constructed has a name that incorporates that of the donor at its beginning, or that of a person that he or she has designated. But not one of the Buddhas whose installation he records—and they appear together with those of Śivas, Viṣṇus and other gods—has a personal name of any kind. The only Buddhist foundations in Kalhaṇa's history with names incorporating the donor's are monasteries (*vihāraḥ*).

What is more, even when royal support for Buddhism was at its most fervent, it seems to have been unwilling or unable to oust Śaivism completely from the circle of royal and state ritual. Nor did Buddhist fervor divert the monarchy from its traditional obligation to uphold the brahmanical Dharmaśāstra that the Śaivas had always accepted as binding in the sphere of law and other mundane transactions.

An undated inscription of the reign of Jayavarman V (K. 111) records his ordinances for the conduct of religion in the Buddhist monasteries of his realm. It also reports that one Kīrtipaṇḍita, a learned follower of the Mahāyāna and an expert in the esoteric Mantra rites of the Yogatantra,[284] was adopted by the royal family as their Guru, giving them many sermons on the Buddhist religion while seated on the Dharma throne (*dharmāsanam*),[285] and that he was engaged within the royal palace to perform frequent

284. The evidence that he was a follower of the Yogatantra form of the Buddhist Way of Mantras is as follows. In K. 111, v. 23 he is said to have been devoted to the four Mudrās: *catussandhyāsu yogātmā caturddānānvito nvaha[m] caturmmudrātmako dharmmañ catuṣparṣatsu *yo diśat* (conj.: *yo* ∪ ⏑ CŒDÈS) 'Devoted to meditation at the four junctures of the day, a giver of the four gifts, one with the four Mudrās, he taught the Dharma to the four congregations'. The four Mudrās are a distinguishing mark of this system; see, e.g., Mkhas grub rje, *Rgyud sde spyi'i rnam par gźag pa rgyas par brjod* (LESSING and WAYMAN 1980), pp. 226, l. 28–248, l. 7. He is said in vv. 28–29 to have resuscitated the long neglected study of the *Madhyavibhāgaśāstra* (= the *Madhyāntavibhāgaśāstra* of Maitreya) (v. 28: *śāstraṃ madhyavibhāgādyaṃ dīpaṃ saddharmmapaddhateḥ / kāladoṣāniladhvastaṃ bhūyo jvālayati sma yaḥ*) and to have sought from abroad and taught the *Lakṣagrantha Prajñāpāramitāsūtra* and the *tattvasaṅgrahaṭīkāditantram* (v. 29: **lakṣagrantham* (corr.: *lakṣagraṇtham* Ep.) *abhiprajñaṃ yo nveṣya pararāṣṭrataḥ / tattvasaṅgrahaṭīkāditantrañ cādhyāpayad yamī*). CŒDÈS took the *Tattvasaṃgrahaṭīkā* mentioned here to be Kamalaśīla's commentary on Śāntarakṣita's *Tattvasaṃgraha*. It appears more probable that having mentioned sources of the two major branches of the Sūtra tradition of the Mahāyāna he now speaks of the complementary Way of Mantras, saying that Kīrtipaṇḍita "taught the Tantra teachings (*tantram*) of such texts as the *Tattvasaṃgraha* and its commentary", that title being an abbreviation, as commonly in Indian sources, for the *Sarvatathāgatatattvasaṃgraha*, the principal scripture of the Yogatantras. This combination of the exoteric and esoteric divisions of the mature Mahāyāna is also referred to in v. 42: *vāhyaṃ guhyañ ca saddharmmaṃ sthāpayitvā cakāra yaḥ / pūjārthan tasya saṃghasyātithes ca pṛthag āśramān* 'Having propagated the Buddhist religion in both its exoteric and esoteric forms he founded separate hermitages to honour the monastic community and [lay] guests'. That the Way of Mantrayāna was also established in Jayavarman's monasteries is clear from the fact that this inscription requires each such institution to engage an officiant (*purohitaḥ*) who must be "adept in the heart[-syllable]s, Mudrās, Mantras and Vidyās, and in the ritual of the fire-sacrifice, and who must understand the secret doctrines of the Vajra and the Bell" (v. 69: **hṛnmudrāmantravidyāsu* (corr.: *hṛnmūdramantravidyāsu* Ep.) *homakarmmaṇi kovidaḥ / bajraghaṇṭārahasyajño dakṣiṇīyaḥ purohitaḥ*).

285. K. 111, v. 32: *sāntaḥpuraiḥ pramuditai rājabhir yyo gurūkṛtaḥ / dideśa vahuśo dharmmaṃ vauddhaṃ dharmmāsane sthitaḥ* 'Appointed as their preceptor by the delighted king and his female household he taught the Buddha's Dharma [to them] on many occasions, seated on the Dharma Throne.' The plural *rājabhiḥ* I take to be a plural of respect (*ādare bahuvacanam*). On the Dharma throne see, e.g., *Suvarṇabhāsottamasūtra*, Parivarta 6, p. 77–78. According to that account when the king wishes to hear

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

rituals for the averting of dangers (*śāntiḥ*), the promoting of welfare (*puṣṭiḥ*) and similar ends, for the protection of the kingdom.[286] But the same inscription, in spite of its purely Buddhist focus, praises Jayavarman V for guiding his subjects in strict accordance with the precepts of brahmanical Smṛti and Śruti.[287] Moreover, the royal high-priest Divākarabhaṭṭa praises him as a devotee of the Śaiva Path of Mantras, that is to say, of the Tantric Śaivism of the Siddhānta, which implies that like other major Khmer monarchs he had received Śaiva initiation at the time of his elevation to the throne in 970 or shortly thereafter.[288]

Since the Buddhist inscription is undated we are not able to assume that his involvement in Śaivism and Buddhism were contemporaneous. He may have been committed to Śaivism around the time of his accession and then turned to Buddhism later. Nor may we assume from Divākarabhaṭṭa's claim that Jayavarman "delighted" (*rarāma*) in the Śaivism of the initiate that his commitments to Śaivism and Buddhism were of a similar kind. It is all too possible that his Śaiva initiation and subsequent involvement in the Path of Mantras were matters of social convention dictated by his position in the state, and that his personal faith in Buddhism was already present at that time. That his Buddhism was indeed a matter of personal conviction is clear enough from his relationship with Kīrtipaṇḍita and his drawing up of regulations to govern the [royal] monasteries. It is confirmed by the name Paramavīraloka he was given after his death. For it was the custom among the Khmers, as it was among their neighbours the Chams, to give their kings posthumous name that expressed the belief that the bearer had ascended to the paradise (-loka, -pura) of a certain god or to some other goal (-pada) of [their] religious endeavour.[289] In the great majority of cases this world or goal is Śaiva. But there are a few

---

the *Suvarṇabhāsottamasūtra* he should sprinkle the palace with scented water, scatter it with flowers, set up a high, richly adorned Dharma throne for the preacher (*dharmabhāṇakaḥ*), decorating the place with chowries, parasols, banners and pennants, and a lower throne for himself on which he is to sit and listen without any thoughts of his royal power.

286. K. 111, v. 36: *rāṣṭramaṇḍalarakṣārthaṃ satkṛtyāyuṅkta yan nṛpaḥ mandirābhyantare* (corr.: *maṇdirābhyantare* Ep.) *bhīkṣṇaṃ śāntipuṣṭyādikarmmasu* 'whom the king bestowed honours on and then engaged repeatedly within the palace in rituals of pacification, invigoration and the like'.

287. K. 111, v. 12–13 and 16: 12 *svarggāpavarggamārgeṇa yaḥ piteva vahan prajāḥ / smṛtiraśmir vvimārggebhyaḥ svendriyāśvān ṇyavārayat /* 13 *vyavahāre satāṃ mārgge manvādīnāṃ mate same kāladhvāntaniruddhe yo *madhyāhnārkka* (corr.: *madyāhnārkka* Ep.) *ivābhavat /* ... 16 *tyaktāṃ dharmmasutenāpi kalidoṣamahodadhau / yaś śrutismṛtihastābhyām uddharet satyatāṅganām* 'Holding the reins of Smṛti, conveying his subjects like a father along the road to heaven and liberation, he restrained the horses of his senses from wandering into the false paths [of forbidden objects]. In law he [Jayavarman V] illuminated the unequalled path of the virtuous taught by Manu and the other [sages], a path that had been obscured by the darkness of [advancing] time, just as the midday sun [illuminates an uneven road that has been obscured by the darkness of night]. ... With the Śruti and Smṛti as his two hands he rescued Lady Truth from the ocean of the defects of the Kali age when she had been abandoned even by the son of Dharma [Yudhiṣṭhira]'.

288. K. 669, v. 21 (A) / K. 263 C, v. 2 (B): *mahīpates tasya babhūva putro digrājavandyo ∪ ∪ – ∪ – yaḥ / dhāteva varṇṇāśramasadvyavasthāṃ kṛtvā rarāmeśvara*mantramārgge* (em.: *mantramārggaiḥ* A: *ma ∪ – ∪*) 'That king had a son [Jayavarman V] who was revered by kings in every direction, who after effecting like Brahmā himself an orthodox settlement of the "order of castes and life-stages" delighted in Śiva's Path of Mantras'.

289. That the Sanskrit compound names in -loka or -pada, literally 'one who has the world or domain [of N]', were understood to mean 'one who has gone to that' or 'who is in that' is revealed by Old Khmer renderings and Sanskrit periphrases. Thus, in the case of Jayavarman III (Viṣṇuloka) we see *vraḥ kamrateṅ añ ta stac dau viṣṇuloka* 'My Sacred Lord, the King who has gone to Viṣṇuloka' (K 256A, ll. 12–13); in the Sanskrit portion of the same inscription we see *mānanīyo guruś śāstā viṣṇulokasthitasya yaḥ / parameśvaraputrasya rājñaś śrījayavarmmaṇaḥ* 'the venerable Guru who was

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

exceptions. Among these are this posthumous name of Jayavarman V and that of Jayavarman VII: Mahāparamasaugatapada. The latter is obviously Buddhist, since it means that the bearer has attained the domain (*padam*) reached by those who are supremely devoted to the Buddha (*paramasaugataḥ*). The former is less obviously so, but it too must be Buddhist, since *vīraḥ* is a common epithet of the Buddha and is not found in Saiddhāntika Śaiva, Pāñcarātrika or brahmanical usage in any appropriate sense that would allow an alternative interpretation. I propose, therefore, that it is equivalent to Paramabuddhaloka and so testifies to the king's personal devotion as opposed to what may have been no more than religious obligations imposed by his position.[290]

As for Jayavarman VII, the intense commitment to Buddhism manifest in his vast architectural undertakings might have been expected to entail that those who sang his praises in the inscriptions would have presented him in purely Buddhist terms, so that we would find no evidence of involvement in the earlier tradition of royal devotion to Śiva. But on the stele in front of the chapel of Lokeśvara in the south-western corner of Angkor Thom a eulogy of this king speaks of him as having Śiva permanently in his heart:

sraṣṭur manobhūr gatavān mano pi
krodhādibhis svair anugair nu dūram
nirasya nityasthitaśūlibhītyā
tān yasya citte vahirańgalīnaḥ
K. 288, v. 24

[When] Love, deprived of his material form entered the mind of the creator [Brahmā], [he did so] with Anger and his other attendants. [But when] he entered the heart of [Jayavarman] [he] surely [did so only] after banishing them afar, because he feared Śiva (-*śūli*-), who was ever present [there].[291]

With this we may compare the following in a eulogy of Indravarman I (r. 877–before 889):

---

the teacher of the son of Parameśvara [Jayavarman II], King Jayavarman [III] who is in Viṣṇuloka' (K 256A, v. 6); and in K. 826, v. 30 we see *sa viṣṇusvāmināmānaṃ murārātim atiṣṭhipat / viṣṇulokapraṇītasya bhūtyai śrījayavarmmaṇaḥ* 'He established a Viṣṇu with the name Viṣṇusvāmin for the welfare of Jayavarman [III] who had gone to Viṣṇuloka'. Similarly, for an early ruler, perhaps Jayavarman I, we find *vraḥ kamratań añ ta dau śivapura* 'My Lord who has gone (*dau*) to the world of Śiva' (K. 451 of 680); *vraḥ kamratań añ ta dau svarga śivapura* 'My Lord who has gone to the heaven that is the world of Śiva' (K. 726); for Jayavarman II (Parameśvara) *vraḥ pāda stac dau parameśvara* 'The Venerable King who has gone to Parameśvara' (K. 956); for Yaśovarman I (Paramaśivaloka) *dhūli vraḥ pāda ta stāc dau paramaśivaloka* (K. 238); for Harṣavarman I (Rudraloka) *vraḥ pāda stac dau rudraloka* (K. 72); for Īśānavarman II (Paramarudraloka) *vraḥ rājya stac dau paramarudraloka* (K. 72).

290. The posthumous name Paramabuddhaloka is seen among the Chams as that of the ninth-century king Indravarman II (C. 67 = M. 36, p. 101). For *vīraḥ* as a name of the Buddha see, e.g., the vocatives *vīra* addressed to the Buddha in the devotional *Śatapañcāśatka* of Mātṛceṭa, vv. 19c, 45c, and 87d.

291. When Love had tried to distract Śiva from his meditation with feelings of desire for Umā, Śiva had punished him by reducing his body to ashes with the fire from his third eye. Love thus disembodied was able to enter the mind of the Creator (Brahmā, Prajāpati), and did so along with anger and the other moral taints that accompany love in lower beings. But Śiva was permanently present in the heart of the King. So Love dared to enter there only after dismissing this company, lest Śiva, who had already destroyed his outer form, be angered by this contamination of his presence and destroy him altogether. The poet thus proclaims the king's moral perfection. If he allowed himself to feel carnal desire it was because he could not otherwise fulfill his duty to his subjects by fathering a son. This is a variant of an ancient theme in the brahmanical portrayal of the ideal king. See, e.g., *Raghuvaṃśa* 1.7d : *prajāyai gṛhamedhinām* 'marrying [only] for offspring'.

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

adhyāste yasya hṛdayaṃ naiva kāmo nirantaram
tatsannihitacandrārddhacūdāmaṇibhayād iva
K. 713, v. 12

Carnal love never entered his heart, as though out of fear of [the god] who wears the digit of the moon on his crest, [since he was] ever (*nirantaram*) present there.[292]

It seems, then, that this reference to Jayavarman VII's devotion to Śiva is conventional praise, part of the stock in trade of royal eulogy. But the fact that it was not considered inappropriate to use it in his case is significant. It is hard to believe that it could have been used if Jayavarman VII would have found that it misrepresented his religious sensibilities.

Similarly, in the same inscription the king is claimed to have been an offerer of sacrifices to Śiva:

dakṣo maheśapratipāditeṣṭir
maheśvaro dhvaṃsitakālakūṭaḥ
jiṣṇus svadārair niyatas sudhīr yo
dakṣeśvarendrāl laghayāñ cakāra
K. 288, v. 91

That wise [king] surpassed Dakṣa, for he was *dakṣaḥ* (a skilled [ruler]) and offered sacrifices to Śiva [unlike Dakṣa who refused to do so]. He surpassed Maheśvara (Śiva) for he was a great lord (*maheśvaraḥ*) and eliminated the dishonesty of the [Kali] Age (*dhvaṃsitakālakūṭaḥ*) [unlike Maheśvara, who did not destroy the Kālakūṭa poison (*dhvaṃsitakālakūṭaḥ*) since though he saved the world from its effects by imbibing it, it remains forever visible in the dark colour of his throat]; and he surpassed Jiṣṇu (Indra), for he was *jiṣṇuḥ* (victorious in battle) and faithful to his wife [unlike Jiṣṇu (Indra), who took many consorts].

Finally, a verse of this inscription compares him to a Śaiva Guru through terms with double meanings, one pertaining to the role of that Guru as the saver of souls through initiation and the other to the king's skill in governance:

gurur ninīṣur bhuvanāni mantraiś
śivan dhruvam mantravidām variṣṭhaḥ
vidhūya dṛṣṭiprativandhabhūtan
tamo nvagād yas samayān aśeṣān
K. 288, v. 79

Wishing to bring mankind to *eternal Śiva / lasting welfare* by means of *the Mantras / his policies* [this] Guru who was the foremost among *the Masters of Mantras / experts in politics* banished the darkness that was the obstacle to knowledge and honoured his pledges.

This might be thought to mean that he too had received Śaiva initiation, because the function of that ritual is believed to be to remove the substance Impurity (*malaḥ*) that prevents the soul from experiencing the deployment of its innate Śiva-ness and because

292. A variant of this verse is v. 19 of K. 826 of A.D. 881/2, also in praise of this king: *na sthātum aśakad yasya hṛdaye kusumāyudhaḥ / tatsannihitacandrārddhacūdāmaṇibhayād iva* 'The Flower-Bowed [Love God] could not dwell in his heart, as though it was afraid of [the god] who wears the sliver of the moon on his crest, [since he was] present there'.

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

"darkness" (*tamaḥ*) is one of the terms used by the Śaivas to denote this Impurity.[293] Moreover, the term *samayān* that I have translated 'pledges' is that used by the Śaivas to refer to the special rules that bind the conduct of persons once they have been initiated. But to compare his governance to the giving of initiation in the first half of the verse and then to report the king's having received initiation in the second seems excessively lame and muddled. If the whole verse is about the king's governance of his subjects compared in all four quarters with the benefit bestowed by a Śaiva Guru on his disciples, then the effect, though not compelling, is at least coherent. It would in any case be improper to say that the person who receives initiation dispells his own darkness. That is the function of the officiant or rather of Śiva acting through him; and the alternative, that we are being told that Jayavarman was himself a Śaiva officiant, is very improbable. That the political sense of the last two quarters lacks attack is a lesser defect than overall incoherence. Perhaps he was referring in the third quarter to the king's exercise of his duty to promote knowledge, certainly evident in his generous provision for education in the Rājavihāra (Ta Prohm), and in the fourth to his loyalty to his followers. Even so, the very fact that the king's conduct towards his subjects is compared to that of a Śaiva Guru towards his disciples shows clearly that the Buddhism of Jayavarman VII was not defined by any radical and intolerant exclusion of Śaivism either by the king himself or by those who like the author of this eulogy wished to win or maintain his favour.

The same conclusion follows from the plan of the Jayaśrīnagarī. Two hundred and eighty-three deities are said to have been enshrined around Lokeśvara Jayavarmeśvara, the king's personal deity at its centre. In addition to various Buddhist deities installed to the south and east of it thirty gods lead by [Viṣṇu] Cāmpeśvara were installed to its west and forty lead by [the Śiva of] Śivapāda to its north.[294] The complex is likewise said to be especially holy because of its association with sacred bathing sites dedicated to the Buddha, Śiva and Viṣṇu. In this regard, we are told, it surpasses even the famous Prayāga of northern India. That is visited by pilgrims seeking purification because the two sacred rivers Yamunā and Gaṅgā come together there. But here three sacred waters combine to empower the site.[295] The same holds with the arrangements for the annual 'durbar' in

293. *Kiraṇa*, ed. Goodall 1988, 2.19c–20b: *malo 'jñānaṃ paśutvaṃ ca tiraskārakaras tamaḥ / avidyā hy āvṛtir mūrcchā paryāyās tasya coditāḥ*. Cf. also v. 49 of the Bilhari inscription of the Kalacuri Yauvarājadeva II (*EI* 1. 251–270) referring to the initiation of Avantivarman in about 825: *mattamayūra-nāthaḥ / niḥśeṣakalmaṣamaṣīm apahṛtya yena saṅkrāmitam paramaho nṛpater avanteḥ* '[Purandara,] the abbot of Mattamayūra, who entirely removed from the king Avanti the black stain of all his Impurity and transmitted to him the supreme radiance [of Śivahood]'.

294. K. 908, vv. 35–38: *āryāvalokiteśasya madhyamasya samantataḥ / śatadvayan trayośītis tena devāḥ pratiṣṭhitāḥ / 36 vivudhāś śrītribhuvanavarmmeśvarapurassarāḥ / trayaḥ pratiṣṭhitās tena pūrvasyān diśi bhūbhṛtā / 37 kāṣṭhāyān dakṣiṇasyāṃ śrīyaśovarmmeśvarādayaḥ / tena pratiṣṭhitā devā viṃśatir dvādaśottarā / 38 śrīcāmpeśvaravimvādyas triṃśat paścimatas surāḥ / kauveryāṃ śivapādādyāś catvāriṃśat pratiṣṭhitāḥ* 'He installed 283 gods around the central Avalokiteśvara, three gods beginning with Tribhuvanavarmeśvara to the east [of it], thirty-two gods beginning with Yaśovarmeśvara to the south, thirty gods beginning with an image of [Viṣṇu] Cāmpeśvara to the west, and forty [gods] beginning with [that of] Śivapāda to the north ...'.

295. K. 908, v. 33: *satkṛtya tīrthadvayasamnidhānāt sādhyo viśuddhyai jagatāṃ prayāgaḥ / kiṅ kathyate vuddhaśivāmvujākṣatīrthaprakṛṣṭā nagarī jayaśrīḥ*. In his annotation of his edition of this inscription Cœdès identified these three bodies of sacred water (*tīrtham*) as the Western Baray, the Eastern Baray (Yaśodharataṭāka) and Preah Khan Baray (Jayataṭāka) or Srah Khan. These would be associated with Viṣṇu, Śiva and the Buddha respectively. The Eastern Baray is referred to as a *tīrtha* in K. 258, A l. 82: *vraḥ tīrtha śrīyaśodharataṭāka*.

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

which, as we have seen, the gods of the Khmers, Śivas and Viṣṇus as well as Buddhas, were to be brought before Lokeśvara Jayavarmeśvara in this complex.

That the strongly Buddhist royal family of this reign was unwilling or unable to sever its links with the non-Buddhist deities of the realm is also apparent from a record of the pious works of Jayarājadevī (/Jayarājacūḍāmaṇi), the devoutly Buddhist chief queen (*agradevī*) of Jayavarman VII. She founded a Buddhist nunnery for abandoned girls, and made gifts to the Eastern Buddha (Pūrvatathāgata), the Jayarājacūḍāmaṇi of the Rājavihāra, the Buddha of the Jayaśrīnagarī (*jayaśrīsugataḥ*), and the [Avalokiteśvara] who Eliminates the Eight Great Dangers (**aṣṭamahābhayaprabhañjakaḥ*),[296] to [Śiva] Bhadreśvara,[297] [Viṣṇu] Cāmpeśvara, the Buddha of Phimai, and the Śiva of Pṛthuśaila,[298] installed and endowed with lands a Śiva and his consort in the temple of Śiva at Baset in Battambang (Jayakṣetraśiva), giving both the name of her husband: a Jayarājeśvara and a Jayarājeśvarī,[299] gave one hundred decorated multi-coloured silk war banners to the god on the Central Mountain (*madhyādrisuraḥ*) for her husband's welfare in the world to come,[300] gilded the Vasudhātilaka temple in Śivapura that had been made in stone by a previous king, and installed golden statues of her three Gurus there.[301] She also set up images of her mother, father, brother(s), friends and family, both those she knew and those of whom she was informed.[302]

It will have been noticed that the deities to whom she made gifts agree closely with those whose images are identified as having to be brought each year to the temple of Lokeśvara Jayavarmeśvara along with the twenty-five Jayabuddhamahānāthas, namely the Eastern Buddha, the Buddha Vīraśakti, the Buddha of Phimai, the Prajñāpāramitā Jayarājacūḍāmaṇi of the Rājavihāra, Bhadreśvara, Cāmpeśvara, and Pṛthuśaileśvara. Nor

296. K. 485, v. 80-86.

297. K. 485, v. 87: *bhadreśvare rūpyamayaṃ suvarṇair ālepitan dundabhim apy adāt sā / devañ ca bhadreśvaraputrabhūtam asthāpayad dundabhisaṃjñam arthāt* 'To Bhadreśvara she gave a gilded silver drum and installed a god called Dundabhi [i.e. Dundabhīśvara] as Bhadreśvara's son'. The drum (*dundabhiḥ* [for *dundubhiḥ*]) has given its name to the deity, a usage of which I know no parallel.

298. K. 485, v. 88: *cāmpeśvarākhye ca sure vimāye vuddhe ca prthvadryabhidhānake ca / śive diśad dundabhim ekam ekaṃ sā svarṇaliptaṃ krtarūpyapūrvvam* 'She gave one gilded silver drum each to the god called Cāmpeśvara, the Buddha at Phimai, and the Śiva called Prthuśaila'.

299. K. 485, v. 89: *sā śrījayakṣetraśive ca devaṃ maheśvaraṃ śrījayarājapūrvam / nāmneśvarīñ ca tathāsapūrvām asthāpayat kalpitadeśabhūmām* 'She installed a god Maheśvara in [the temple of] Jayakṣetraśiva preceded by Śrījayarāja- [i.e. Śrījayarājeśvara] and an -īśvarī with the same prefix [i.e. Śrījayarājeśvarī], on whom she settled land revenues'.

300. K. 485, v. 90.

301. K. 485, v. 91-92: *vasudhātilakaṃ pūrvakṣitīśena śilākrtam svarṇaiḥ prāvrtya sā dharmād dyobhūmyos tilakaṃ vyadhāt / sā sādhu tatra trigurūn sauvarṇān ratnabhūṣaṇān asthāpayac chivapur[e] prataptān iva bhāsvarān.* 'She made the Vasudhātilaka ['The forehead ornament of the Earth'] that had been built in stone by a former king the forehead ornament of both the earth and the heavens by covering it with gold. She piously installed in that [temple] in Śivapura golden bejewelled [statues of her] three Gurus, that shone as if on fire'.

CŒDÈS proposes (*IC* 2:180, n. 2) that the Vasudhātilaka may be the Phimeanakas, the small pyramid-based single-towered laterite state-temple of Sūryavarman I. But this is blocked by the next verse, which says not, as CŒDÈS translated it, that she installed statues in Śivapura ('A Çivapura, elle érigea ...') but that she did so "*there* in Śivapura" (*tatra ...asthāpayac chivapure*). I do not see any alternative to concluding that the Vasudhātilaka too was in Śivapura, namely Phnom Bayang or Phnom Sandak. CŒDÈS's translation treates the crucial *tatra* as though it were redundant. There is certainly no clue that he recognizes the presence of the word.

302. K. 485, v. 93: *mātaraṃ pitaraṃ bhrātrsuhrdvandhukulāni ca / jñātāni jñāpitāny eṣā sarvvatrāsthāpayat sudhīḥ.*

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

are the non-Buddhist deities treated less generously. The Buddha of Phimai, the Śivas Bhadreśvara and Pṛthuśaileśvara and the Viṣṇu of Cāmpeśvara each receive the same gift: a gilded silver drum. As for the "Central Mountain" to whose god she dedicated banners for the welfare of her husband after his death, CŒDÈS suggested that this might be the Bayon at the centre of Jayavarman's capital. But the text speaks of a god rather than a Buddha, the Bayon has not been called the Central Mountain (*madhyādriḥ*) in any other inscription, and there is an obvious alternative in Phnom Bakheng, the Śaiva state-temple of Yaśovarman I, constructed *c.* 900, since that is known in Old Khmer as Vnaṃ Kantāl, "the central mountain".[303]

Relations between the Religions

Relations between the three faiths were generally tolerant. The inscriptions speak of Vaiṣṇava, Śaiva and Buddhist family lineages among the nobility,[304] but they record cases of marriage between persons of these different faiths,[305] and show that the palace, though predominantly Śaiva, was not exclusively so.

Among the Khmer kings of Angkor Jayavarman V and Jayavarman VII were fervent promoters of Buddhism, as we have seen, and at least two were devotees of Viṣṇu: Jayavarman III (r. *c.* 835–before 877) and Sūryavarman II (r. 1113–*c.* 1150). This is apparent from their posthumous names, Viṣṇuloka and Paramaviṣṇuloka, which assert that these kings ascended after death to the paradise of Viṣṇu.[306] Moreover, the preceptor of Jayavarman III was the Bhāgavata Śrīnivāsakavi;[307] and a bas-relief in Angkor Vat depicts Sūryavarman II going forth to war mounted on an elephant preceded by a small statue of Viṣṇu on Garuḍa.[308]

303. K. 265, S ll. 4–5: *vraḥ kamrateṅ aṅ [vnaṃ ka]ntāl*; K. 235, D ll. 12–13: *man vraḥ pāda paramaśivaloka sthāpanā vnāṃ kantāl* 'Then the Venerable Paramaśivaloka [Yaśovarman I] established the Central Mountain'; K. 774.

304. K. 180, v. 24: *svesāṃ māheśvarāṇāṃ yaḥ kulānāṃ patiḥ*; K. 444, B ll. 28–30: *dhūli vraḥ pāda dhūli je[ṅ vraḥ] kamrateṅ aṅ śrī jayavarmmadeva phle māheśva[rānva]ya* 'My Venerable Majesty Jayavarman [V], born of a Śaiva lineage'; K. 532, v. 35: *[śu]ddhavaiṣṇavavaṃśo* 'of a pure Vaiṣṇava lineage'; K. 687, v. 19: *yo ninditapurodbhūtavaiṣṇa* ⏑ ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ – (perhaps °*vaiṣṇavānvayasambhavaḥ*); K. 86, v. 8: *jinānvayāṃ* 'of the lineage of the Buddha'.

305. K. 86, v. 8: *adiśat kṣitīndraḥ tāṃ bhāgineyāṃ prakṛtiṣṭhagotrāṅ jinānvayāṃ viṣṇumayāya bhartre* 'the king [Jayavarman VII] gave that daughter of his sister, who possessed an inborn seed of Buddhahood [and] was in a family [who were devotees] of the Buddha, to [Tribhuvanabrahmendra], a devotee of Viṣṇu, as her husband'. CŒDÈS has misunderstood the terms *prakṛtisthagotrām*, *jinānvayām* and *viṣṇumayāya bhartre*: 'appartenant à un clan très pur, et descendant du Jina, à un époux participant de la nature de Viṣṇu'. For the technical Mahāyānist meaning of *gotram* and its *prakṛtistham* variety see RUEGG 1969 *passim*. For the suffix *-mayaḥ*, literally 'one with' in the meaning 'devoted to' in *viṣṇumayāya* see, e.g., *Mahābhārata* 6.26.10ab (*Bhagavadgītā* 4.10ab): *vītarāgabhayakrodhā manmayā mām upāśritāḥ*, and also *śivātmā* in the meaning 'devoted to Śiva' in K. 534, v. 13 (= K. 382A, v. 13).

306. For Viṣṇuloka see above, n. 289. For Paramaviṣṇuloka (Sūryavarman II) see K. 298 (CŒDÈS 1911, 201) in the western gallery of the bas-reliefs of Angkor Vat: *saṃtac vraḥ pāda kamrateṅ aṅ paramaviṣṇuloka nā stac nau vnaṃ śivapāda pi pañcuḥ vala* 'Our Venerable Majesty King Paramaviṣṇuloka on the hill of Śivapāda about to lead forth his army'.

307. K. 256 A, v. 5–10.

308. The scene is depicted in the bas-relief of Sūryavarman II's march to war (*yātrā*, *prayāṇam*) in the west half of the southern gallery of the third enclosure. This scene is described in FREEMAN and JACQUES 1999, 59–60. The practice of going into battle with an image of one's personal deity and the belief that this will protect one's troops and confound those of the enemy, is well attested in Indian

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

Jayavīravarman (r. 1002–*c.* 1010) too may have been a devotee of this god. His posthumous name, if he was given one, has not been recorded, but he is described as having taken up his rule by Viṣṇu's favour.[309]

Moreover, there were high-born Vaiṣṇavas in the royal staff. We hear, for example, of members of a corps of Bhāgavata royal servants (*bhāgavata paṃre*) and their chief (*mūla bhāgavata paṃre*) going back to the time of Jayavarman II,[310] and of the Vaiṣṇava endowments of a Pāñcarātrika noble Kṣetrajña, given the title Mahendropakalpa 'Assistant to the King', who was the barber of Rājendravarman and had served in some capacity under all four preceding rulers. His ancestors too are traced back to the reign of Jayavarman II.[311] Other Bhāgavatas who served the palace received -upakalpa titles with the same meaning. Nṛpatīndropakalpa, the daughter of whose sister became the chief queen of Rājendravarman, has been encountered above in connection with his extensive Vaiṣṇava endowments; and he was a matrilineal descendant of a certain Narendropakalpa, the bother of his maternal grandmother (*mātṛmatulaḥ*). We also have a record of the Vaiṣṇava endowment of a dignitary who had received the title Rājopakalpa from Jayavīravarman (1002–1006).[312]

K. 91, an Old Khmer inscription from the reign of Jayavarman VI (1080–1107) at the earliest records a matrilineal line of Guru mandarins beginning with Kavīśvarapaṇḍita, described as an observer of the rule of the Pañcarātra (*śīla pañcarātra*), who became the Guru and counsellor of [the Śaiva] King Sūryavarman I. Of his two brothers, Jātibindu,

---

Buddhist sources and in Far-Eastern sources derived from them; see *Mañjuśrīmūlakalpa* 54.32–41: an image of Mañjuśrī to be taken into battle on the back of an elephant or on a standard; *Mahābalasūtra*, Tibetan translation, para. 19: 'Mahābala attaché à l'étendard, quoi qu'il arrive dans la bataille, l'adversaire ne saura faire aucun mal'; Taishō 1248, a ritual of Vaiśravaṇa attributed to Amoghavajra, but not found in the Korean Tripiṭaka, teaches that one should attach an image of Vaiśravaṇa to a staff and enter battle with this standard carried fifteen paces in front of the army (DEMIÉVILLE 1929–30, 81b, ll. 41–44). The eulogy of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa king Govinda III in his Nesarikā grant of 805 A.D. boasts that he has seized the standards (*cihnāni*) of thirteen kings: the Fish from the kings of the Pāṇḍyas, the Bull from the Pallava king and the kings of Kosala and Avanti, the Tiger from the Cola king, the Elephant from the Gaṅga king, the Bow-stock from the king of Kerala, the Boar from the king of Andhra, the Cālukya, Maurya, and Siṃhala, and the goddess Tārā from Dharmapāla, the king of Bengal. He then brought the whole world under his Garuḍa standard (*EI* 34, 19).

309. K. 989 A, v. 7: *āsīd aśeṣāvanipālamaulimāṇikyakoṭidyutirañjitāṅghriḥ / caturbhujadvāradhṛtādhirājyaḥ prājyodayaś śrījayavīravarmmā* 'There was Jayavīravarman, [a king] of great success, whose feet were illuminated by the radiance from the tips of the emeralds on the crown of every king, who took on the position of supreme ruler through [the intervention of] the four-armed [god]'. For the convention that *caturbhujaḥ* 'the four-armed' means Viṣṇu see, e.g., K. 165 S, v. 4; K. 256 C, v. 1; K. 275, v. 8; K. 323, v. 1; K. 528, v. 208; K. 532, v. 43; K. 534, v. 10 (= K. 382 A, v. 4); K. 814, v. 1; K. 814, v. 29 (= K. 256 C, v. 22). The expression *caturbhujadvāradhṛtādhirājyaḥ*, which I have translated 'who took on the position of supreme ruler through [the intervention of] the four-armed [god]' may also refer to the date of his accession : 'who took on the position of supreme ruler in 924 [śaka]'. CŒDÈS proposes only the second interpretation (*IC* VII, 179).

310. K. 165, K. 989 B, and K. 1036.

311. K. 522 of the reign of Rājendravarman (A.D. 944–968), after 28 January 953, since it refers to the temples in the Yaśodharataṭāka, whose deities were installed on that date.

312. K. 856, v. 23, K. 814, E, v. 54. Other holders of variants of this title were Dharaṇīndropakalpa during the reign of Rājendravarman (K. 262), a Kṣitīndropakalpa, whose title was given after his death to his matrilineal descendant Śivavindu (K. 278, v. 18), and Pṛthivīndropakalpa (the courtier Paramārthaśiva) (K. 382 C, v. 5). See also K. 208, v. 53 (Rājendropakalpa). The Sanskrit term *upakalpaḥ*, literally "one who prepares or provides", i.e. "an assistant" (Old Khmer *upakalpa*) is not used to my knowledge in this sense in Indian sources. In Old Javanese *upakalpa* denotes a religious officiant of some kind; see ZOETMULDER 1982, s.v.

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

and Śrīkaṇṭhapaṇḍita, the latter is said to have taught at the Śaiva site of Śivapāda. His son, unnamed, had a son Vāgīśvarapaṇḍita, who became the principal fire-sacrificer (*hotā*) of Harṣavarman III and the Guru of the queen. This record shows conclusively that families were not strictly Śaiva or Vaiṣṇava, that members of the same family could be of different religions, and that a Pāñcarātrika could preside in Śaiva centres, for Kavīśvarapaṇḍita is said to have been in control of the hermitages of Īśvarapura, Śivapura, Sūryaparvata and Jalāṅgeśvara and to have installed a Liṅga and a Bhagavatī on vacant land acquired by royal favour and a Caṇḍī in the temple of K.J. Govinda, evidently a Vaiṣṇava establishment.

There is evidence that the state did limit the freedom of individuals to change their religion, but only in the special case of persons from certain title-groups (*varṇa*) who had been selected for training as Śaiva officiants in the service of the king. A decree of Jayavarman V (r. *c.* 970–1000) forbids these from becoming Vaiṣṇavas (*bhāgavata*). K. 444B, ll. 9-13:

> *nau rū kule ta qnak si [man ta] āc ti paryyann hoṅ nāṃ mok oy ācāryya [caturācāryya] pre paryyān sikṣā āy nagara pi pre nā vraḥ rājakāryya nā paṃnvās vvaṃ āc ti bhāgavata*
>
> As for males of these families, those competent to be taught should be brought to the Ācāryas among the Caturācāryas. It is ordered that they should be trained by them in the royal capital and that they should then work in the service of the king (/in royal ceremonies) as religious officiants and should not be able to become Bhāgavatas [Vaiṣṇavas].

and insists that the women of the families from which they were selected should be given in marriage to none but persons who are of the highest status (*uttama*) and devotees of Śiva. K. 444B, ll. 2–4:

> *nau aṃpall kule ta strījana oy ta qnak ta uttama pi śivabhakti. vvaṃ āc ti qnak ta hīnajāti yo[k d]au pi pañjā qnak khloñ*
>
> As for the women of these families, they are to be given to those who are [of] superior [status] and devoted to Śiva. Men of low birth (*hīnajāti*) may not take them to make them their wives.

The Unchanging Śaiva Temple Cult

Indian Śaivism was not static. During the course of several centuries new systems evolved and co-existed with their antecedents as beneficiaries of state-patronage. This history also affected the Khmers, who received the religion in at least two waves. The first is seen in inscriptions of the principalities of the pre-Angkorean period from the seventh to the early eighth century, the second in those of the kingdom of Angkor from the ninth to the fourteenth. These two forms of the religion fall within what Indian Śaiva sources call respectively (1) the Atimārga ('The Supra[-mundane] Path'), intending thereby the various divisions of the Pāśupatas, principally the Pāñcārthikas, Lākulas/Kālamukhas and Somasiddhāntins, and (2) the Mantramārga ('The Path of Mantras'), corresponding to what modern scholars have called Āgamic or Tantric Śaivism, principally that of the Saiddhāntikas, the followers of the Siddhānta. But it should be understood that the differences between these two traditions, the Khmer evidence for which will be the principal subject of the second part of this study, bear for the most part on the private practice of initiates. Śiva temples in which Śiva was worshipped in the form of the Liṅga

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

and associated hermitages for the support of Śaiva ascetics were institutions that appear to have remained unchanged in their fundamentals whatever the initiatory affiliation of the religious attached to them, and it is these common externals that are all that are usually apparent to us and recorded in the inscriptions.

This relatively unchanging aspect of the religion, which was already in place when the Atimārga held sway and which was inherited by the Saiddhāntikas when they came to the fore, was that of lay devotion (*śivabhaktiḥ*). Though the worship of initiates was focused on Śiva alone and on Śiva in one iconic form, the temples of Śiva in which they officiated for the benefit of the laity accommodated a broader range of deities. There was a single Śiva at the heart of each foundation, generally embodied in a Liṅga,[313] who received a version of the regular worship that initiates were required to perform for themselves. But the sites also enshrined (1) ancillary Śiva forms that had no role in the higher worship of the initiated, but evoked the mythological dimensions of the deity that are so central a feature of lay devotion, and (2) images of various other deities besides. As elsewhere in the Indic world distinctions between the religions were less relevant in the lay domain, where piety tended to be inclusive.

Thus during the reign of the pre-Angkorean ruler Īśānavarman I (*c.* 610–628) the temple of the Śiva Prahasiteśvara in his capital Īśānapura (Sambor Prei Kuk), named after the Indian Śiva Prahasiteśvara of Pāṭaliputra in Magadha, received installations not only of a golden Liṅga, but also of a silver image of Vṛṣabha (Śiva's bull), a Brahmā and a Sarasvatī (his consort) and four anthropomorphic ancillary Śiva forms: (1) that in which the left of his body is that of Viṣṇu, called Harihara or Śaṅkaranārāyaṇa, (2) that in which this half is his consort Umā, called Ardhanārīśvara or Gaurīśvara, (3) dancing Rudra, called variously Nṛtyarudra, Nṛtteśvara, Nṛtyeśvara, Naṭeśvara, Nāṭakeśvara and Nāṭyeśvara, and (4) a Śiva pure and simple, probably single-faced and two-armed:

hariśambhor umārddhāṅgasaṃhatasya pinākinaḥ
vṛṣabhāṅkasya – – ⏑ catasraf pra[timā imāḥ]
32 *kārttasvaramayaṃ liṅgam idañ ca sacaturmmukham*
śarvvasya †śarvvarīdhvāntanīvṛtāṅgaṃ ⏑ – ⏑ – †
33 *pratimeyaṃ sarasvatyā iyan nṛtteśvarasya ca*
vidhinā sthāpitaṃ sarvvam idan tena mahībhujā
34 *sthāpiteyaṃ pratikṛtir vṛṣabhasya ca rājatī*
yā mūrttir iva dharmmasya paripūrṇnā kṛte yuge

K. 440, vv. 31–34

31a *hariśambhor umārddhāṅga* em. : *hari ⏑ ⏑ ⏑ – rccāṅga* Ed. **31c** *vṛṣabhāṅkasya* corr. : *vṛṣabhāṅkasyā* Ed. **32a** *kārttasvaramayaṃ liṅgam* em. : *kārttasvaramayaliṅgam* Ed.

These four images of Harihara, Ardhanārīśvara, Śiva [and ...], this golden Liṅga together with [an image of] the Four-faced [Brahmā], this image of Śiva .....; this image of Sarasvatī, and this of Nṛtteśvara: all this has been installed by that king. He has further installed this silver image of [Śiva's] Bull, which seems to be the body of Dharma in the Kṛta Age, [when it was still] undiminished.[314]

313. A notable exception is the golden image of Parameśvara (Śiva) consecrated by Rājendravarman in A.D. 948 in the central shrine at Baksei Chamkrong, as recorded in K. 286, v. 45: *sa divyadṛśvā parameśvarasya hiraṇmayīm apratimāṃ vidhānaiḥ / upāskṛtemāṃ pratimāṃ pravīṇaḥ prāsādaśobhāñ ca sudhāvicitrām* 'With celestial vision this gifted king provided with all due rites this matchless golden image of Parameśvara and adorned the temple-towers with beautiful stucco-work'.

314. In his edition and translation of K. 440 (*JC* 4, 5–11) CŒDÈS expressed the view that *hari ⏑ ⏑ ⏑ – rccāṅgasaṃhatasya pinākinaḥ* (31ab) ('Hari ... de l'Archer (Çiva) uni au corps de ...') referred to Viṣṇu and Harihara, i.e. the Śiva form which is half Śiva (Hara) and half Viṣṇu (Hari). But the fact that we have

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

Śaiva sites during the Angkorean period show the same openness. In addition to the primary Liṅga, the image of the five-faced, ten-armed Sadāśiva, the icon that Saiddhāntika Śaiva initiates are to visualize when they worship Śiva in the Liṅga,[315] the guardians Nandin and Mahākāla who stand at the right and left of the doorway into Śiva's shrine,[316] and the wrathful Caṇḍeśvara, who receives the offerings that remain after Śiva's worship (*yajñaśeṣaḥ*),[317] in addition, that is, to the deities that are found in the private cult of Śaiva

---

hari rather than *hareḥ* and the Śaiva context render this interpretation less probable. The syllables *rccāṅga* that CŒDÈS read after the lacuna are surely an error (his or the engraver's) for *rddhāṅga*. Cf. K. 228, v. 5b: *harārddhāṅgadharā*; K. 583, v. 1 (= K. 70, v. 2): *namo 'stu ta[s](mai) [ru](drā)ya yadarddhāṅgaṃ ha(ri)r ddadhau*; *Kathāsaritsāgara* quoted in *Śrīvidyāmantravivṛti*, f. 35r: *tathā ca bṛhatkathāsaritasāgare devīṃ prati / mahādevavacanam: "madīyārdhāṅgabhūto 'sau tato viṣṇus tvadātmanā / yo hi nārāyaṇaḥ sā tvaṃ śaktiḥ śaktimato mama / tataḥ prabhṛti vikhyātaṃ rūpadvayam idaṃ mama / ardhanārīśvaraṃ rūpam ardhahāriharaṃ vapuḥ / ato dadāmi nityatvaṃ svabhakteṣu harer gatim" iti.*

Vṛṣa (Śiva's bull) is seen as the embodiment or symbol of pious religious observance (Dharma). See, e.g., *Śivadharmottara* D, f. 71r4: *īśvarāyatanasyādhaḥ śrīmān dharmavṛṣaḥ sthitaḥ* . In the Kṛtayuga, the first and best in the cycle of the four ages, Dharma is believed to have been complete and to have diminished by one quarter with each age until now, in the fourth age, the Kaliyuga, only one quarter (*pādaḥ*) remains. Vṛṣa, being four-footed (*catuṣpādaḥ*), symbolizes the Dharma complete with all four of its quarters (*catuṣpādaḥ*).

315. See CŒDÈS 1923, 25–27, plates XI, 2, XII, 1-3, LI, 3. XI, 2. There is a relief sculpture in which a standing Sadāśiva is flanked by reverentially kneeling figures of Viṣṇu (viewer's right) and Brahmā (viewer's left) on the rock face a few metres to the north of the Vat Phu sanctuary, illustrated in UNESCO 1999, 89. For an eight-armed variant see the 12th/13th century bronze in SOTHEBY'S 1995, pl. 99.

316. K. 191, v. 45; K. 275, v. 7; K. 278, v. 26 ; K. 300, v. 64. For the role of Nandin and Mahākāla as Śiva's door-guardians see, e.g., Trilocanaśiva, *Somaśambhupaddhativyākhyā*, IFI T. 170, 27–28; Jñānaśivācārya, *Jñānaratnāvalī*, IFI T. 231, p. 39; *Tantrāloka* 15.183c–187.

317. *Kiraṇa* f. 49v3: *tarpayed yajñaśeṣeṇa caṇḍeśaṃ ṭaṅkadhāriṇam* 'With the remnants of the sacrifice he should make an offering to the hatchet-wielding Caṇḍeśvara'. Caṇḍeśvara/Caṇḍa/Caṇḍarudra has his shrine in the NE corner of the Indian Śaiva temple compound. This is surely the deity given as Candīśvara in K. 593, v. 1 and K. 278 B, v. 26. The former records the installation of a Candīśvara, a Gaṇeśa, a Liṅga and the Grahas (*candīśvaraṃ vighnapatiñ ca liṅgaṃ / grahais saha sthāpitavān*), the latter that of a Liṅga and the re-installation of a Gaṇeśa, a Candīśvara, a Nandin and a Mahākāla: *padmāsane sphāṭikam īśaliṅgaṃ / yas sthāpayām āsa yathāvidhānam / vighneśacandīśvaranandikālān / punar yathāsthānam *atiṣṭhipac* (em. BARTH : *adhiṣṭhipac* Ep.) *ca*. I am unaware of any surviving Khmer image of this deity. However, the fact that he is in the company of Gaṇeśa, Nandin and Mahākāla make it unlikely that it is not Caṇḍeśvara that is intended. For these are all deities of the same class, being among the eight leaders of Śiva's attendant demigods (*gaṇeśvarāḥ, pramathanāyakāḥ*) that are worshipped in the systems of some of the Śaiva Tantras as the deity-circuit outside the Vidyeśvaras, between the latter and the Lokapālas. The other four are Skanda, the skeletal devotee Bhṛṅgin/Bhṛṅgiriṭi, Śiva's Bull, and Ambikā/Umā (*gaṇamātā* 'the Mother of the Gaṇas'). See, e.g., *Kiraṇa* ff. 40v6–41r1: *evaṃ *syād* (corr. : *syā* Cod.) *dvāravinyāsaḥ padmaiḥ *pūjyāḥ* (corr. : *pūjyā* Cod.) *khageśvarāḥ* (i.e. *khaga* (voc.) *īśvarāḥ* [= *vidyeśvarāḥ*]) / **īkṣṇāgrotpalasaṃsthānāḥ* (corr. : *īkṣṇāgrotpalaṃsaṃsthānā* Cod.) **pūjyāḥ* (corr. : *pūjyā* Cod.) *pramathanāyakāḥ / lokeśāḥ svastikaiḥ pūjyāś caturbhāgavivartitaiḥ*; *Mṛgendra* 3.20–26b; *Sarvajñānottara* B, p. 37 (*Śivārcanaprakaraṇa* 35ab, 37c–39a, 39c): *vidyeśvarāṃs tṛtīye tu pūrvād ārabhya vinyaset / ...gaṇeśvarāṃś caturthe tu kauberyāśādiśaḥ kramāt / *devīṃ* (conj. : *divaṃ* Cod.) *caiva tu caṇḍeśaṃ mahākālaṃ ca nandinam / gaṇādhyakṣaṃ ca bhṛṅgīśaṃ vṛṣabhaṃ skandam eva ca / dhyāyet ...pañcame lokapālāṃs tu kramād āvaraṇe budhaḥ / vinyased astramārgeṇa dhmāta-cāmīkaraprabhān*; *Bṛhatkālottara* f. 19r5 (13.102c– 103): *anantādyān dalāgreṣu vidyeśāṃs tatra pūjayet / pīṭhakaṇṭhe gaṇeśāṃs tu lokeśān pīṭhapādataḥ*. Cf. also the opening sequence of deities invoked in the *śāntyādhyāyaḥ* of the laity's *Śivadharma*: Śiva, Umā, Skanda, Nandin, Gaṇeśa, Mahākāla, Ambikā (Gaṇamātṛ), Mahiṣāsuramardinī (Durgā), Bhṛṅgin/Bhṛṅgiriṭi, and Caṇḍeśvara, followed by Brahmā, Viṣṇu and the Mothers. See also the pre-Angkorean inscription K. 22, which records the

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

initiates, we find installations of Śiva's vehicle (*vāhanam*), the Bull (*vṛṣaḥ*, *vṛṣabhaḥ*) who sits facing the Liṅga of the central shrine,[318] the four ancillary Śiva forms already mentioned (Harihara,[319] Ardhanārīśvara/Gaurīśvara,[320] the dancing Rudra,[321] and the simple Śiva[322]) and Umāmaheśvara, also called Umeśa, in which Umā, Śiva's consort, sits on his right thigh with his right arm around her.[323]

---

installation of a Harihara, and *viṣṇucandeśvareśānaliṅgam*, which most probably means 'a Viṣṇu, a Caṇḍeśvara, and a Śivaliṅga' (cf. K. 834, v. 84: *liṅgam aiśānam*), as thought by CŒDÈS (*IC* III, 145).

318. K. 300, v. 64. The Bull has been generally called Nandin or Nandi in secondary sources both Indological and Khmerological. But this usage is extremely rare in Indian sources before modern times (see G. BHATTACHARYA 1956) and is never seen in the Khmer inscriptions. In the classical and learned Sanskrit sources Śiva's mount is always simply "the Bull" (*vṛṣaḥ*, *vṛṣabhaḥ*). The current usage is particularly unfortunate since Nandin (/Nandi/Nandīśa/Nandikeśa) is the name of the entirely different, anthropomorphic figure that stands guard at the right door-post of the entrance to the Śiva shrine, as Mahākāla guards the left.

Śiva's Bull is understood as the embodiment of religious observance, *dharmaḥ*; and in consequence the word *vṛṣaḥ* is found as a synonym of *dharmaḥ* in Khmer and Indian inscriptions (K. 282 D, v. 9; K. 286, v. 20; K. 834, v. 44; Gwalior Museum Stone Inscription of Pataṅgaśambhu (MIRASHI 1962), l. 15 (re the ascetic Vyomaśambhu): *vṛṣaikaniṣṭho 'pi jitasmaro 'pi yaḥ śaṅkaro 'bhūd bhuvi ko 'py apūrvvaḥ* 'He was a new and extraordinary *Śaṅkara/bestower of happiness* in this world, [since he was] *completely devoted to piety/rode only on the Bull* and had *conquered lust/conquered the God of Love*'; ibid. ll. 24-25 (re Pataṅgaśambhu): *acalasthitivṛṣaniratah prakaṭīkṛtaviṣamadarśanaḥ satatam / yo vijitamakaraketur ddhūrjjatilīlām alaṃ vahati* 'He fully imitated Śiva, being *content with unchanging piety/dwelling the Himālaya and fond of the Bull*, *always clarifying abstruse doctrines/with his three eyes ever manifest*, *having conquered lust/having defeated the Love God*'.

319. K. 583, v. 1 (= K. 70, v. 2); K. 366, l. 16; K. 904 B, ll. 14 and 17; K. 926, Khmer, l. 3. For [standing four-armed] images see e.g., JESSUP and ZÉPHIR 1997, nos 16 and 17 (7th century), 40 (10th century; head only).

320. K. 324 B i, v. 1; K. 528, v. 7 and 135.

321. K. 908, v. 30 (*nāṭyeśvarau svarṇamayau*); K. 276 (Pra Keo), ll. 6–13: [Yogīśvarapaṇḍita] gave a palanquin on which he installed a fully adorned, ten-armed V.K.A. Śrī Nātakeśvara (= Nāṭakeśvara) (*vraḥ kamrateṅ aṅ śrīnātakeśvara daśabhuja*), along with the necessary vessels for his cult in gold and silver, a peacock-feather parasol, and the inhabitants of Aṃpeṇa to serve him. I have not noted the name Nāṭakeśvara in any Indian source; but it is very improbable that this is other than the form called Nāṭyeśvara, Nṛtteśvara etc., especially in the light of its description here as ten-armed. The same applies to the Nartakeśvara whose installation is recorded in Ka. 18 B, ll. 2 and 36–37. Khmer examples of ten-armed dancing Rudras have survived. He is found as the deity on temple tympana at Banteay Srei, Sikhoraphum and Phnom Rung. From the Prasat Thom at Koh Ker there survive exquisite fragments of a five-faced, ten-armed dancing Rudra in stone, of about twice human size (JESSUP and ZÉPHIR 1997, no. 42). BOISSELIER (1955, 198) wrongly identified the image as a Sadāśiva.

322. K. 95 A, v. 32: *catasraś śivayor arccā yaś śrutīr iva pāvanīḥ / dvīpe śrīndrataṭākasya pitṛbhūtyai samaṃ vyadhāt* 'He installed together four images of Śiva and his consort, like the four purifying Vedas, on the island in the Indrataṭāka for the welfare of his parents'; K. 323, v. 59 (the same installation); K. 191, v. 46 (a golden anthropomorphic image of Śiva); K. 528, v. 207: *saṃprāptayoḥ prāptayaśās svapitror bhuvaḥ patiḥ so 'pi bhavodbhavena / *sasthānatāṃ* (em. : *sa[ṃ]sthānatāṃ* FINOT) *sthāpitavān sthitijño nime ime dve śivayoḥ śivāya* 'Having acquired fame that lord of the earth, knowing the sacred order, installed two images, one of Śiva and the other of his consort for the welfare of his two parents now that they had gone to dwell with Śiva in his world'. For surviving [two-armed mild standing] Śivas of the Angkorean period see, e.g. JESSUP and ZÉPHIR 1997, nos 33, 38 (head only), and 57.

323. K. 300, v. 64: *+ + + + + + + +m umayā sahitaṃ punaḥ / nandinaṃ kālasaṃyuktaṃ haimaśṛṅgagirau vṛṣam* '[a Śiva] together with Umā, [the two door-guardians] Nandin and Mahākāla, and the Bull, on the Mt. of the Golden Peak (= Ta Keo)'. See the Umāmaheśvara from Banteay Srei, *c.* A.D. 967 (Phnom Penh, National Museum, Ka 1797) illustrated in JESSUP and ZÉPHIR 1997, no. 56. For the bull see ibid., no. 24.

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

We also find images of the following deities of the wider pantheon at Śaiva sites: Durgā Mahiṣāsuramardinī, Umā, Gaṇeśa, Skanda, Viṣṇu (including the forms Trivikrama and Hayagrīva), Brahmā, Sūrya, Lakṣmī, Sarasvatī, the Lokapālas, the Grahas (the Sun, the Moon, the five visible planets, and Rāhu and Ketu, the ascending and descending nodes of the moon personified as the causes of eclipses), the river Ganges (Gaṅgā) and Bhīma.[324]

Similarly, Śaiva temples in which a central shrine of Śiva was flanked by shrines of Brahmā and Viṣṇu were not uncommon in the region. Examples of such complexes are those built by, or in the reign of Yaśovarman I (889–910) on the hills Phnom Krom and Phnom Bok roughly equidistant from the pyramid-based temple of Yaśodhareśvara, the Liṅga incorporating his name on the summit of Phnom Bakheng at the centre of his new capital Yaśodharapura (Angkor).[325] Others, all tenth-century, are recorded in K. 94 (on Phnom Trâp), K. 352–354 (at Rudrapada [Prasat Kantop]), and K. 532 (at Banteay Kdei). During the reign of Rājendravarman Hṛṣīkeśa, Śaivācārya and tutor of the royal family, had a Brahmā and a Viṣṇu installed to the right and left of a Liṅga established by his Guru in Yaśodharapura (Angkor),[326] and these two gods are portrayed kneeling on either side of a standing Sadāśiva in a bas-relief on the rock-face behind the Vat Phu Śiva temple.[327]

324. K. 176, a cave inscription on Phnom Kulen below one of the images that adorn the walls, records the installation by a Śivasoma, the Śaiva ascetic occupying the cave, in A.D. 1074/5, of the gods Śiva etc., their consorts Umā etc., the Gaṇas; Śiva with Viṣṇu, the Gaṇas and Umā; Brahmā [?: *prathamamakhabhuk*]); K. 191, v. 41: a Liṅga, a Viṣṇu and a Sarasvatī; K. 218, reign of Sūryavarman I (A.D. 1002–1050): a Liṅga, an Umā, a Trivikrama Viṣṇu, a Hayagrīva, and a Trailokyasāra (Viṣṇu); K. 254 B, ll. 17–23: a Liṅga, a Viṣṇu, and a Devī; K. 258 C, v. 26: two Liṅgas with a Viṣṇu; K. 286, v. 32: Śiva, the Goddess (Umā), Viṣṇu, and the two Goddesses (Lakṣmī and Sarasvatī?) in the Baksei Chamkrong; K. 366, ll. 16–17: a Liṅga, a Mahiṣāsuramardinī and a Viṣṇu; K. 528, v. 218: Rājendreśvara on the Eastern Mebon together with a Viṣṇu, a Brahmā, a Śiva and a Gaurī; K. 528, v. 205: a Liṅga, a Viṣṇu, a Gaurī and a Śiva on the south bank of the Yaśodharataṭāka; K. 532, vv. 1–6: Śiva, Viṣṇu, Brahmā, Umā, Sarasvatī, the Śivaliṅga of Aninditapura; K. 702, v. 22: Śiva and Sarasvatī; K. 56 B (Vaiṣṇava): Lakṣmī, five Viṣṇus, Kātyāyanī (Durgā), Gaṅgā, a Viṣṇu sleeping on the ocean (Jalaśāyin); Mahiṣāsuramardinī: K. 56 B, v. 18cd (Kātyāyinī); K. 257, ll. 31–32; K. 534, v. 21. Skanda: K. 57, v. 36; Gaṇeśa: K. 346, v. 36 (= K. 95 A, v. 36); K. 358 (an image); the Grahas: K. 593 (A.D. 930); K. 726 (8th century), listing their names; Gaṅgā: K. 56 B, v. 19 (emending *tripathagāṃ tanum* to *tripathagātanum*); K. 826, v. 29 (with Śiva and Umā: *umāgaṅgābhujalatāsaṃśliṣṭajaghanasthalam / sa īśvaraṃ sthāpitavān umāgaṅgāpatīśvaram*; see CŒDÈS 1939). Cf. K. 300, v. 26 (= K. 95 A, v. 36), which refers to a Yogin's vision of Śiva accompanied by Umā and Gaṅgā. The identity of Bhīma is problematic. It is mentioned to my knowledge only in K. 532, v. 27: *liṅgaṃ bhīmapure moghapure liṅge ca sa vyadhāt / liṅgaikāṃśau sabhīmārccāv aninditapure punaḥ* 'He established a Liṅga at Bhīmapura, two Liṅgas at Amoghapura, two parts of a Liṅga together with an image of Bhīma in Aninditapura'. Perhaps it was an image of the Epic Hero Bhīma. A cult of this Bhīma in association with the Liṅga cult was practised in East Java at Sukuh on the slopes of Mt. Lawu. Several Bhīma statues survive from this area. He appears in Old Javanese literature as a compassionate saviour of souls, a tradition that has survived in the Balinese shadow play. See DE CASPARIS and MABBETT 1992, 317. For surviving images of these deities see, e.g., JESSUP and ZÉPHIR 1997, nos 18 (Durgā Mahiṣāsuramardinī); 19, 29 (Umā); 43 (Umā as Gaṇa dancing before the dancing Rudra); 26 (Gaṇeśa); 25 (Skanda); 15, 30, 31, 34, 39 (head only), 67, 69, 70 (four-armed standing Viṣṇu holding the disc of the earth on his lower right palm); 68 (Viṣṇu reclining on the waters); 14, 46 (Hayagrīva, both pre-Angkorean), 45 (Brahmā); 47 (the Lokapāla Varuṇa); 66 (Lakṣmī?); MIKSIC and SOEKATNO 1995, 128, no. 9 (Bhīma). For Khmer sculptures of the nine Grahas, from all periods see K. BHATTACHARYA 1956, 1957 and 1958; MALLERET 1960; and BÉNISTI 1976; JESSUP and ZÉPHIR 1997, nos 58 and 62.

325. CŒDÈS 1968, 113; JACQUES 1999, 42 (map), 62.

326. K. 532, v. 43: *[te]nemau sthāpitau devau caturāsyacaturbhujau / [da]kṣiṇottarayor atra guru-śāśanavarttinā.*

327. Illustrated in UNESCO 1999, 89.

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

In Central Java we see the same arrangement in the great Śaiva temple-complex built in the late ninth or early tenth century at Prambanan near modern Yogyakarta, where the Śiva temple (the Candi Loro Jonggrang) (47m in height; 34m x 34m at the base) is flanked by two somewhat smaller temples housing Viṣṇu and Brahmā (33m in height; 20m x 20m at the base). We see it also in Pura Meru, the state-temple established in 1720 in Cakranegara on Lombok. There too there are three pagodas in an inner courtyard. That of Śiva is in the centre with eleven roofs, that of Viṣṇu on the north with nine, and that of Brahmā on the south with seven.[328] The same triad is conceptualized in the eleven-roofed pagodas that dominate the three shrine-complexes of Purah Besakih on Mount Agung, Bali's principal state temple. The main pagoda of the central complex (Pura Penatarang Agung) is dedicated to Śiva, while those of the complexes to the left and right of it (Pura Batu Madeg and Pura Dangin Kreteg) are dedicated to Viṣṇu and Brahmā respectively.[329] The ninth-century Candi Srikandi on the Dieng Plateau in Central Java has the same three deities in relief: Śiva on the east wall, flanked by Viṣṇu on the north and Brahmā on the south.[330] In the fourteenth century the East Javanese poet Mpu Tantular of Majapahit depicts an imaginary landscape that includes a ruined Śaiva temple complex on a mountainside comprising shrines of Śiva and Viṣṇu with one of Gaṇapati under the gate.[331]

This laity-orientated Śaiva inclusivism is also evident in the benedictory verses that open the Khmers' Sanskrit inscriptions. Those that record benefactions creating or supporting Vaiṣṇava and Buddhist establishments open with strictly Vaiṣṇava (Pāñcarātrika) or Buddhist benedictions. This convention is also seen with some of the Śaiva benefactions. But many of the inscriptions recording these, while giving precedence to Śiva or to Śiva and his consort (Umā/Gaurī), go on to venerate other gods, typically Brahmā and/or Viṣṇu (commonly both), sometimes with Lakṣmī and/or Sarasvatī.[332]

In this openness the Khmers were following the long-established practice of India. There too Śaiva temple sites housed a wider range of deities, bridging the gap between the exclusive worship of the initiates and that of the laity on whose support they were dependent. But the Khmers were following more than the principle here. For the Śiva-forms and ancillary deities of their Śiva temples are precisely those which are prescribed for this purpose in the surviving Indian Śaiva scriptural sources, or rather in the earliest of them available to us, which comprise most of the works of this kind that were known to Indian Śaiva scholars between the tenth century and the thirteenth.

The most important of these are unpublished Pratiṣṭhātantras, works concerned specifically with the installation (*pratiṣṭhā*) of Liṅgas and images, the consecration of temples, other religious edifices and the royal palace, and the ancillary topics of iconometry, iconography and architecture. They are the *Devyāmata*, the *Piṅgalāmata* alias

328. For these numbers of roofs for pagodas of Śiva, Viṣṇu and Brahmā in Balinese temples see VAN EERDE 1910.

329. STUART-FOX 2002, 95–97.

330. SOEKMONO 1990, 68.

331. Mpu Tantular, *Arjunawijaya* 32.2 (*śiwawimba, harirūpa, gaṇa*); also Mpu Tantular's *Sutasoma* 13.1–2, locating the Viṣṇu to the north and the Gaṇa (Gaṇapati) under the gate. See S. SUPOMO 1977, 2:312–313 (ad *Arjunawijaya* 32.2).

332. See, e.g., K. 70: Śiva, Harihara, Viṣṇu; K. 34, K. 235, K. 436, K. 661: Śiva, Viṣṇu, Brahmā; K. 92: Śiva, Devī, Viṣṇu, Brahmā; K. 136: Śiva, Brahmā, Viṣṇu, Sarasvatī; K. 190 B: Śiva, Viṣṇu, Brahmā, Gaurī, Sarasvatī; K. 218: Śiva, his Śakti, Viṣṇu, Brahmā; K. 228: Śiva, Viṣṇu, Brahmā, Umā; K. 323: Śiva (as taking form as Brahmā, Viṣṇu and Rudra), Viṣṇu, Brahmā; K. 532: Śiva, Viṣṇu, Brahmā, Gaurī, Sarasvatī; K. 702: Śiva, Viṣṇu, Brahmā, Umā, Sarasvatī, Lakṣmī; K. 834: Śiva, Narasiṃha, Viṣṇu, Brahmā, Sūrya, Sarasvatī; K. 989: Liṅga, Śiva (Parameśvara), Umā, Nārāyaṇa and Lakṣmī; K. 1002 (JACQUES 1968): Śiva, Umā, Sarasvatī, Viṣṇu, Brahmā.

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

Jayadrathādhikāra, the *Mayasaṃgraha* and the *Mohacūrottara*. All have come down to us in early Nepalese palm-leaf manuscripts.[333]

Kashmirian Śaiva scholars of the mid-tenth to early eleventh century, whose works are our earliest body of detailed, citation-rich Śaiva exegesis, were familiar with at least the first three. One of these scholars, Bhaṭṭa Nārāyaṇakaṇṭha, appears to have written a commentary on the *Piṅgalāmata*, since it is mentioned and attributed to him by the twelfth-century South-Indian Śaiva authority Trilocanaśiva in his commentary on the *Somaśambhupaddhati*;[334] and another, Vidyākaṇṭha, a pupil of Bhaṭṭa Nārāyaṇakaṇṭha's famous son Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha II, wrote a commentary on the *Mayasaṃgraha*, which has survived complete in a single Kashmirian manuscript under the title *Bhāvacūḍāmaṇi*,[335] a work of importance not only in its own right but also because it is our only evidence of the contents of substantial parts of the text it explains, the *Mayasaṃgraha* itself having come down to us in a single incomplete manuscript.[336] The commentary cites the *Devyāmata*[337] and, very frequently, the *Piṅgalāmata*.[338] The fourth work, the *Mohacūrottara*, also referred to as *Mohaśūrottara* and *Mohacūḍottara*,[339] is not cited or named by any of the

333. The relevant sections of these sources are as follows: *Devyāmata*, ff. 66v4–73r4 (Paṭala 61: *surāṇāṃ vividhapratimālakṣaṇapaṭalaḥ*); *Piṅgalāmata*, ff. 13r2–27v3 (Prakaraṇa 4: *pratimādhikāraḥ*); *Mohacūrottara*, ff. 4v2–9v1 (Paṭala 2: *vyaktaliṅgaprakhyānam*). The relevant section of the *Mayasaṃgraha* is one of those missing in the incomplete *codex unicus*, but its contents can be determined from the commentary on this text (*Bhāvacūḍāmaṇi*) composed by the Kashmirian Saiddhāntika Vidyākaṇṭha II, pupil of Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha II.

334. *Somaśambhupaddhativyākhyā*, p. 99: *tad uktaṃ piṅgalāmataṭīkāyāṃ nārāyaṇakaṇṭhena pīṭhāntaṃ pīṭhavyāpīti*.

335. For my evidence that the author of the commentary was a pupil of Rāmakaṇṭha II rather than the Vidyākaṇṭha who was a pupil of Rāmakaṇṭha I, and for my identification of the *Mayasaṃgraha* of the Nepalese ms. as the work known to the early Kashmirian commentators, see Dominic GOODALL 1998, x–xiii. I am very grateful to him for providing me with a photocopy of his photocopy of the Jammu manuscript, which he had acquired seeing that it might be a previously unknown work of Kashmirian Saiddhāntika literature, and to another of my former pupils John NEMEC, who kindly acquired a direct photocopy of the manuscript for me in Jammu, a copy which proved, unlike the first, to be completely legible. This *Mayasaṃgraha* is not to be confused with the published. South-Indian *Mayamata*. They have in common only that they are Śaiva works on Pratiṣṭhā attributed to Maya, the architect of the Asuras.

336. Prakaraṇa 2 of the *Mayasaṃgraha*, the section on iconometry and iconography (*pratimālakṣaṇaprakaraṇam*), is covered in the commentary on ff. 12r7–21v9.

337. Ff. 56v and 58v, on both occasions with the erroneous spelling *Divyāmata*, which no doubt reflects the tendency of the speakers of Kashmiri who transmitted this text not to distinguish Sanskrit *ī* and *e*; see GRIERSON 1915, 3b–4a.

338. E.g. ff. 4v, 8v, 21r, 24r, 25r, 25v, 35v, 37v, 40r, 43r, 43v, 44v, 50v, 53r, 53v, 55r, 57v, 61r, 61v, 62v, and 66r. The other works of this class that are cited as authorities by Vidyākaṇṭha are the *Nandikeśvaramata* (ff. 17v, 18r, 53r, 54r, 67r), the *Pratiṣṭhāpārameśvara* (ff. 7r, 8r, 12r, 13v, 17v, 23r, 24v, 57v, 67r), the *Paitāmaha* and the *Pratiṣṭhāsamuccaya* (ff. 17r, 22r, 58r, 58v, 59r, 60r, 66r). I know of no surviving manuscript of any of these.

339. The name of this text is a puzzle. In the opening section Indra, the pupil here, says that he has already been taught the *Mohacūḍa* (1.2ab: *tvatprasādāt parijñātaṃ mohacūḍaṃ mayā prabho*), and asks Skanda to teach him the *Mohacūrottara* (1.3cd: *mohacūrottaraṃ śāstraṃ tadarthaṃ vaktum arhasi*) to provide detailed instruction on the Liṅga and temples mentioned there. We therefore expect *mohacūḍottaram* 'The Sequel of the *Mohacūḍa*', but the unmeaning *-cūrottara-* is repeated in all the colophons. The original source of the text, a mythical work in 70 million verses, is also *Mohacūra* in the closing verses of the work (f. 46v5–6: *saptakoṭipravistīrṇān mohacūrān mayā tava / vyākhyātaṃ sāram ādāya lakṣagranthena suvrata / punaḥ pṛṣṭaḥ samāsena tvayāhaṃ suranāyaka / tad ākhyātaṃ tadarddhena mohacūram mayā hare / siddhisārasahasrais-tu yugmacandrais tad antataḥ / yogajñānādisaṃyuktaṃ vyākhyātaṃ śāstram uttamam / susaṃkṣepaṃ sugambhīram pratiṣṭhātantram*

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

tenth-century commentators of Kashmir. But it was known to Somaśambhu, who cites it in his *Karmakāṇḍakramāvalī* (*Somaśambhupaddhati* 4:85, v. 42), which he completed in A.D. 1095/6 while he was abbot of the Central-Indian Golakīmaṭha. It is excerpted by Hṛdayaśiva, probably of Mālava, in his unpublished *Prāyaścittasamuccaya*,[340] which may prove to have been earlier. But the evidence now available to me indicates that it may have been composed at any time from the late ninth century to 1157/8, the date of the earliest manuscript.[341]

We also have the *Kiraṇa* and the *Netratantra*, both major scriptural sources for the Kashmirians of the tenth century, the former surviving in a Nepalese manuscript completed in A.D. 924/5, the latter in one of 1200.[342] Neither of these Śaiva scriptures is a work devoted exclusively to Pratiṣṭhā, but both include important relevant information on the range and iconography of deities. Chapter 52 (*vyaktaliṅgalakṣaṇam*) of the *Kiraṇa* sets out the iconography of the wider Śaiva pantheon, that is to say, of the images of the various deities that a Śaiva officiant may be expected to install. The *Netratantra* teaches the specialized cult of the Mantra-deity known as Mṛtyuñjaya, Amṛteśa[bhairava] or Netranātha, but it is a peculiarity of its system that the Mantra is absolutely universal in that the officiant initiated into its cult is empowered to use it in the worship of any deity. The Mantra is constant; only the visualization changes. In this context the text sets out in its thirteenth chapter the principal forms of the deities whose worship may be assimilated. The range is wider than that of the other texts, since the *Netratantra* is not narrowly concerned with the programme of images in the Śaiva temple-complex but envisages the whole range of deities, including the Buddha, whose worship was part of the religious calendar of the court, in which this Śaiva specialist was to serve in a role that encompasses and exceeds that of the brahmanical royal chaplain (*rājapurohitaḥ*). Though its iconographical information is less detailed than that of the other five works mentioned it is of use in that it agrees closely with the range of Śiva-forms envisaged in those sources.

These, minor discrepancies apart, are just those seen in the surviving inscriptions and statuary of the Khmers: the mild one-faced and two-armed Śiva, the ten-armed, five-faced Sadāśiva, the ten-armed dancing Rudra, Ardhanārīśvara, Harihara/Śaṅkaranārāyaṇa, and Umāmaheśvara.[343] The same applies to the wider Śaiva pantheon taught for installation in

---

uttamam. We also see it with the citation of the text in the manuscripts of the *Prāyaścittasamuccaya* of Hṛdayaśiva. South-Indian citations always give the title as *Mohaśūrottara*, which removes the problem but is certainly a misguided attempt to correct what was probably seen as a Tamilism, for Sanskrit -*ś*- is rendered by -*c*- in Tamil transcription. The puzzling spelling is also supported by the Kashmirian manuscripts of the *Karmakāṇḍakramāvalī* of Somaśambhu. The Kashmirian edition has *mahādūrāntare* for the locative singular of this title in v. 1361b, but records the obviously less corrupt variant *mohadūrāntare*. This *dū* is more probably a corruption of *cū* than of *śū*, because *cū* and *dū* resemble each other in the Kashmirian Śāradā script to a degree that makes confusion easy, whereas *śū* and *dū* do not. Moreover, *cū* and *dū* have one style of postconsonantal *ū*, whereas *śū* shows the other. I find the title in the expected form *Mohacūḍottara* in two Maharashtrian sources: a manuscript of Kamalākarabhaṭṭa's *Śūdradharmatattva* (AUFRECHT 1864, 279a) and the published edition of the *Caturvargacintāmaṇi* (1:134, 135) composed by Hemādri while he was a minister of the Yādava king Mahādeva of Devagiri (r. 1260–1271). I have retained the prevalent spelling in preference to this plausible correction.

340. Ff. 103v1–111r1. = *Mohacūrottara*, ff. 42v4–47r2 (the end).

341. For these termini see SANDERSON 2001, 3.

342. *Amrteśatantra*, NAK MS 1-285, NGMPP Reel No. B 25/5; palm-leaf; Nepalese 'Pāla' script.

343. *Devyāmata*, ff. 66v4–69r2: Naṭeśvara surrounded by the dancing Gaṇas (Nandin, Mahākāla, Umā, Skanda, Caṇḍeśvara and Bhṛṅgīśa/Bhṛṅgiriṭi), Ardhanārīśvara, Umāmaheśvara/Umeśa, mild Maheśvara forms (two-armed in the capital, four- or eight-armed in a Pattana), and various many-armed Bhairava-like fierce (*raudra*-) forms (for the wilds and villages); *Mohacūrottara*, ff. 7r5–8r3: Sadeśāna

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

these texts, which comprises Gaurī, Durgā Mahiṣāsuramardinī, Brahmā, Viṣṇu, Skanda, Gaṇeśa, Nandin, Mahākāla, Sarasvatī, the Sun, or the Sun and the other eight heavenly bodies (Grahas), the Lokapālas, the seven Mothers with Vīreśa, and, in some cases, also Lakṣmī and Bhairava.[344] The only major discrepancy between the Indian Śaiva and Khmer Śaiva evidence is that the latter reveals no instance of the installation of images of Bhairava or of the Seven Mothers (Brahmāṇī to Cāmuṇḍā) and Vīreśa. This might suggest the possibility that the Khmers received their Śaivism before these elements had been integrated into its programme of temple images. But this is unlikely, since Śaivism's engagement with these deities goes back at least to the fourth century of the Christian era. The Vākāṭaka king Rudrasena I (r. A.D. *c.* 335–*c.* 360) is described as a loyal devotee of

---

(Sadāśiva), Ardhanārīśvara, Umeśa, Haranārāyaṇa (Harihara), and Nṛtyeśa/Nṛtyarudra; *Mayasaṃgraha* (*Bhāvacūḍāmaṇi*, f. 19r14–v3): ten-armed Śiva, Śiva on his bull, Ardhanārīśvara, naked and ithyphallic in the Devadāruvana, Nāṭyastha and Śaṅkaranārāyaṇa (Harihara); *Kiraṇa*, Paṭala 52: ten-armed dancing Rudra, Umāmaheśvara, Ardhanārīśvara, Rudra-and-Kṛṣṇa (Harihara); *Netratantra* 13.29–32b: ten-armed Rudra on his bull, four-armed Śiva with trident, gesture of protection, citron and rosary, Nāṭyastha, Ardhanārīśvara, Harihara, Vivāhastha, Samīpastha (= Umāmaheśvara?); and *Piṅgalāmata* f. 19v2 ff.: Nāṭeśvara, Sadāśiva (four-faced and eight-armed), Umāmaheśvara, Ardhanārīśvara, and Harirudra (Harihara).

344. *Devyāmata*, ff. 69r2–73r3: Viṣṇu forms (four-armed, seated on a lotus or on Garuḍa, Viśvarūpa, Narasiṃha, Trivikrama, Vārāha), Brahmā, 10-armed Mahiṣāsuramardanī, fierce eight-armed Kauśikī, Skanda, Gaṇeśa, the Lokapālas, Vīreśa and Gaṇeśa with the seven Mothers Brahmāṇī to Cāmuṇḍā, Śrīdevī (Lakṣmī), and the Sun; *Mohacūrottara*, ff. 8r3–9v2: Viṣṇu, Brahmā, the Sun, the Moon, the other Grahas, Gaṇeśa, Skanda, Nandin, Mahākāla, the ascetic Pārvatī (Aparṇā/Tapogaurī), Durgā Mahiṣāsuramardinī and Sarasvatī; *Mayasaṃgraha* (*Bhāvacūḍāmaṇi*, f. 18v10–19r13): the eight Vidyeśvaras (ten-armed), the Gaṇas (Bhṛṅgin etc.), Gaurī mounted on a lion, Gaṇeśa, the hundred Rudras, the Lokapālas (with Yama + Kāla, the Pitṛs and Vyādhis), Rudra and the Gaṇas, Brahmā; 19v4–21v3: various forms of Viṣṇu (one-faced, three-faced and four-faced, on Garuḍa, lying on the ocean [*jalaśāyī*], on Śeṣa with Lakṣmī), the ten Avatāras of Viṣṇu, the seven Mothers, the Grahas, Durgā, Gaurī, Sarasvatī, the seven ṛṣis, Revanta, Dhanvantari and the two Aśvins, the Rivers, and the Kṣetrapālas; *Kiraṇa*, Paṭala 52: Brahmā, Skanda, Gaṇeśa, Caṇḍikā/Mahiṣāsuramardinī, the Lokapālas, Īśa (= Vīreśa) as the lute-playing (*vīṇāhastaḥ*) leader of the seven Mothers (*mātṛṇām agraṇīḥ*), the seven Mothers, Āmardaka (ferocious, two- or four-armed carrying a knife and skull or severed head), the Sun, Sarasvatī, and Gajalakṣmī; *Netratantra* 13.2–16: Viṣṇu: one-faced, four-armed Nārāyaṇa; three-faced, six-armed on Garuḍa with lateral Narasiṃha and Varāha faces and Lakṣmī as consort; eight-armed on a ram [= Bālasaṃkarṣaṇa]; Viśvarūpa; on the ocean (*śayanasthaḥ*), in marriage with Lakṣmī (*vivāhasthaḥ*); with Lakṣmī as half his body (Lakṣmīvāsudeva); Narasiṃha, Varāha, Vāmana, Kapila, and Avyakta; 13.17–28: various images of the Sun; 13.32c–43: Brahmā with the four Vedas, the Buddha, Skanda, Kāmadeva, Sūrya, Soma, Gaṇeśa, the Lokapālas etc.; and *Piṅgalāmata* ff. 17v3–27v3: Bhairava and the Mothers, Gaṇeśa, Skanda and the other Gaṇas, Lakṣmī, Sarasvatī, Durgā, the ascetic Pārvatī (*pañcāgniḥ*), Mahādeva and the hundred and eight Rudras, the eight Vidyeśvaras, the Lokapālas, Viṣṇu, the ten Avatāras of Viṣṇu, Brahmā, Gāyatrī, Sāvitrī, the Grahas, the Nāgas and Nāginīs, Yakṣiṇīs etc. Among these sources the *Netratantra* and the *Piṅgalāmata* stand apart from the mainstream tradition seen in the *Devyāmata*, *Mohacūrottara*, *Mayasaṃgraha* and *Kiraṇa*. The subtypes detailed in the *Netratantra* belong, I shall argue elsewhere, to a Kashmirian tradition with strong local features. The *Piṅgalāmata* is not a text of the Siddhānta but rather of the Yāmala tradition of the Śākta Śaivism of the Vidyāpīṭha. It affiliates itself to the *Brahmayāmala* (*Picumata*) and in accordance with this stance, though it covers Saiddhāntika territory, it teaches the iconography of the deities of the Vāma, the Dakṣiṇa (*Picumata*) and the Trika, and builds up the role of Bhairava and the Mother Goddesses in its general Śaiva iconography. In the absence of the relevant portion of the text of the *Mayasaṃgraha* it is impossible to be sure that all the deity-forms in Vidyākaṇṭha's commentary were in that text. His reference to three- and four-faced Viṣṇus seems likely to have been added on the basis of what he knew of the distinctive Kashmirian Pāñcarātrika tradition.

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

"Great Bhairava";[345] and a copperplate decree issued by Mahārāja Bhuluṇḍa in A.D. 376 from Bagh (Valkhā) in Madhya Pradesh records a grant made to support the worship of the Mothers in a temple of those deities established by a Pāśupatācārya Bhagavat Lokodadhi.[346] But in all other respects we find a strikingly close correlation between the Khmer evidence of the range of deities installed in Śiva temples and that prescribed in these early sources of Indian Śaivism. And this correlation demonstrates that the Śaivism of the temples underwent little change when patronage shifted from the Atimārga to the Mantramārga. For although the extant Indian textual sources that record this iconography belong to the Mantramārga, the same iconography, with the exception of the Mantramārga's Sadāśiva, is in evidence among the Khmers in the seventh century, well before the Mantramārga reached their shores.

The Problem of Provenance

What we do not find among the Khmers or their neighbours in mainland and maritime Southeast Asia is any trace of that range of ancillary Śiva-forms that has seemed so central to students of Śaiva India because they are found throughout the Śiva temples of the Tamil-speaking South, where Śaivism has been best preserved down to modern times, and because they are those prescribed in Śaiva scriptures transmitted under ancient titles in that region.[347] I refer to forms such as Bhikṣāṭana, Somāskanda, Kaṅkālarūpa, Candraśekhara, Dakṣiṇāmūrti, Gaṅgādhara, Tripurāntaka, Liṅgodbhava, Kāmāri, Kālāri, Caṇḍeśvaraprasāda, and Naṭarāja.[348]

345. EI 22, 171 (Tirodi plates of Pravarasena II, r. *c.* 400–*c.* 450, 1, ll. 3–6): *atyantasvāmimahābhairavabhaktasya ...vākāṭakānām mahārājaśrirudrasenasya*. For these approximate regnal dates of Rudrasena and Pravarasena see BAKKER 1997, 169.

346. RAMESH and TEWARI 1990, 21–22 (no. 10), ll. 2–: *bhagavallokodadhipāśupatācāryya-pratiṣṭhāpitakapiñchikānakagrāmamātṛsthānadevakulasya piñchikānakam eva grāmaṃ saha bhadradattavāṭakagrāmavāṭakachena devāgrāhāramātṛṇā[ṃ] balicarusatradhūpagandhapuṣpamālyopayojya-bhogāya ....*

347. I refer to the *Kāmika*, *Kāraṇa*, *Ajita*, *Raurava*, *Suprabheda*, *Dīpta*, *Vātulaśuddhākhya*, *Aṃśumatkāśyapa*, and related Āgamas. See *Ajitāgama*, *Kriyāpāda* 36.207–288b; *Rauravāgama*, *Kriyāpāda* 35.114–292.

348. A tradition of sixteen ancillary forms is taught in the *Dīpta*, pp. 684–5: 17.119 *ṣoḍaśapratimākāraṃ vīkṣyate vidhinādhunā / prathamaṃ sukhāsanaṃ proktaṃ vaivāhikaṃ dvitīyakam /* 17.120 *tṛtīyam umayā yuktaṃ vṛṣārūḍhaṃ caturthakam / pañcamaṃ tripuraghnaṃ ca nṛttarūpaṃ ca ṣaṣṭhakam /* 17.121 *candraśekharam evoktaṃ saptamaṃ tu vidhīyate / aṣṭamam ardhanārī ca navamaṃ hari-r-arddhakam /* 17.122 *caṇḍeśvaraprasādan tu daśamaṃ parikīrtitam / *kāmāry* (em.: *kaumāry* Cod.) *ekādaśaṃ proktaṃ dvādaśaṃ kālanāśanam /* 17.123 *trayodaśaṃ dakṣiṇāmūrtiṃ bhikṣāṭanam ataḥ param / sadāśivaṃ paṃcadaśaṃ vidyāl liṅgodbhavaṃ ca ṣoḍaśa*. This list is followed by the *Sūkṣma* and the *Īśānaśivagurudevapaddhati* (*Kriyāpāda* 43.1–84b). The *Rauravāgama* teaches fourteen forms (*Kriyāpāda* 35.1–292): Someśvara, Somāskanda, Vṛṣārūḍha, Tripurāntaka, Candraśekhara, Kālāri, Kalyāṇamūrti, Naṭarāja (Bhujaṅgatrāsanṛtta), Uddaṇḍanṛtta, Atyuddaṇḍanṛtta, Bhikṣāṭana, Kaṅkāla, Ardhanārīśvara, and Dakṣiṇāmūrti. The *Ajitāgama* teaches the following twenty ancillary Śiva forms and other deities for installation in Śiva temples (*Kriyāpāda* 36.207–375a): Liṅgodbhava, Sukhāsīna, with Gaurī, Bhikṣāṭana, Kaṅkālarūpa, Nṛttarūpa, Trimūrti, Cakrada, Candraśekhara, Devyardha, Dakṣiṇāmūrti, Kāmāri, Kālāri, Vaivāhya, Somāskanda, Jalandhara, Harihara, Vṛṣārūḍha, Tripurāntaka, and Viṣasaṃharaṇa; Viṣṇu, Brahmā, Śakti, Vināyaka, Skanda, Sūrya, Durgā, Kṣetrapāla, Caṇḍeśa, Moṭī, Jyeṣṭhā, Śāstṛ, the Dikpālas, the Mātṛs and Gaṇas, Vīrabhadra and Gaṇeśa, the Rudras, Ādityas, and Vasus, the Vidyeśvaras, the eight Mūrtis, Nandin and Mahākāla, Śailādi, Śrī, Sarasvatī, Agastya, Nārada, the Gaṇas, Bhṛṅgi, Gaṇeśvaras, Rudrakiṅkaras, Bhaktas, and Vṛṣa.

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

But this should not be read as evidence that the temple Śaivism of the Khmers cannot have reached them from the Tamil-speaking region of South India. It may have been introduced from another source, but the mere absence of the Śaiva iconography distinctive of that vigorous cultural zone does not settle the matter, since our evidence of Khmer Śaiva images goes back to the seventh century and so long predates the emergence of that iconography.

Against influence from this region one might also point to the Indian Śivas that proliferated in the Khmer realm during the pre-Angkorean period. We find no Śiva from the Tamil cultural zone among them and so might wish to conclude that the Khmers must have received their Śaivism from another direction. But this too carries no weight, since the names chosen are those of Śivas sanctified by inclusion in the lists of the early Śaiva tradition. That tradition is North-Indian in origin, as can be seen from the fact that the Śiva temples of its lists are overwhelming concentrated in that region. There are only three sites that approach the South and they are outposts: Śrīśaila (Tripurāntaka) and Saptagodāvara (Bhīma) in Andhra, and Gokarṇa (Mahābala) just below Goa in northern Karṇātaka. But the tradition, with its religious topography, spread throughout India and indeed beyond it and therefore could have been brought to the Khmers from any part of the subcontinent.

Thus while it is entirely possible that the Khmers received their Śaivism from sources other than the Tamil South, there is as yet no evidence that definitely excludes that region. On the contrary there is evidence of South-Indian influence in other spheres that should make us hesitate to do so in this. There are the scripts of the Khmers and Chams, which are based on South-Indian models, and there is evidence that both peoples knew the *Mahābhārata* Epic in its South-Indian recension. The evidence is slight in the case of the Khmers. A single verse cited in an inscription shows a reading that appears in all but one of the South-Indian manuscripts that have been collated and in only one other.[349] But the evidence is firmer for the neighbouring Chams, since one of their Sanskrit inscriptions relates the myth of Śiva's destruction of the celestial palaces of the three Asuras in a variant that appears only in that recension.[350]

349. K. 279, C1, v. 1–2: *sa hi viśvambharādhīśas sarvvalokagurus smṛtaḥ / yad iṣṭan tasya tat kuryyād vyāsagītam idaṃ yathā / sarvvalokaguruñ caiva rājānaṃ *yo vamanyate* (em.: *yo timanyate* Ep.) / *na tasya dattan na kṛtan na śrāddhaṃ phalati kva cit*. The expression *vyāsagītam* in 1d evidently means 'taught by Vyāsa [in the *Mahābhārata*]' for the verse that follows is from that source. In the Poona critical edition it is given as follows (12.65.28): *paralokagurum caiva rājānaṃ yo 'vamanyate / na tasya dattaṃ na hutaṃ na śrāddhaṃ phalati kva cit*. According to the editors' apparatus criticus all the manuscripts collated read *sarvalokagurum* as in this citation, except for two from Kashmir and a single Devanāgarī witness (Ś1, K1.4 and D1), whose reading they have adopted. The reading *kṛtaṃ* is found in D7 and in all the South-Indian witnesses except G2.

350. C. 99 = M. 17, the My-son stele inscription of Vikrāntavarman (7th-8th century), v. 4: *sāvitrī-jyāsanāthapraṇavadṛḍhadhanur muktavāṇārivāṇaṃ kṛtvā somorupuṅkhaṃ sphuradanalamukhaṃ sāra-thīḍāviriñcam / aṣṭārddhabrahmadhuryaṃ sakalasuramayasyandanaṃ viṣṭapānāṃ śāntyarthaṃ yena dāho yugapad api purā traipurāṇāṃ purāṇām* 'Who of old simultaneously burned for the peace of the worlds the palaces of the Traipura [Asuras], having made the Praṇava (OṂ) his strong bow, the Gāyatrīmantra its bow-string, Viṣṇu the arrow, Candra its broad flight-feather, blazing Agni its barb, and all the gods his chariot with the four Vedas as its horses and Iḍāviriñca as his charioteer'. Commenting on this MAJUMDAR (1985, 34) reports that the story to which this verse alludes is given in the *Anuśāsanaparvan* (= *Mahābhārata* 13.145.24–29b). But this is not the poet's source, since several of the details differ. This version makes Yama rather than Soma the flight-feather and the Vedas rather than Praṇava the bow, while the inscription makes the four Brahmas (the Vedas) the horses. The true source is the *Droṇaparvan* in the Southern Recension. This version begins as in *Mahābhārata* 7.173.52–56a: *asurāṇāṃ purāṇy āsaṃs trīṇi vīryavatāṃ divi / āyasaṃ rājataṃ caiva sauvarṇam aparaṃ mahat / āyasaṃ tārakākṣasya kamalākṣasya rājatam / sauvarṇaṃ paramaṃ hy āsīd vidyunmālina eva ca / na*

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

In the first part of this study I have considered evidence for Khmer Śaivism in general in its relations to other religions, society and the state. In the second I shall turn to that for specific Śaiva traditions, beginning with the Atimārga and proceeding to the Mantramārga.

Abbreviations

ASB = Asiatic Society of Bengal, Calcutta
BEFEO = *Bulletin de l'EFEO*
BL = Bodleian Library, Oxford University
BORI = Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute (Pune)
C = Cham inscription, numbered as in SCHWEYER 1999
CSS = Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series
EFEO = École française d'Extrême-Orient
EC = *Epigraphia Carnatica*
EI = *Epigraphia Indica*
EITA = MEISTER 1983–91
IC = *Inscriptions du Cambodge* (CŒDÈS 1937–1966)
IFI = Institut français d'Indologie, Pondicherry
ISC = *Inscriptions sanscrites du Cambodge* (BARTH 1885)
ISCC = *Inscriptions sanscrites de Campā et du Cambodge* (BERGAIGNE 1993)
GOS = Gaekwad's Oriental Series, Baroda
K = Khmer inscription, numbered as in CŒDÈS 1966
Ka = Khmer inscription as published in *NIC*
KSTS = Kashmir Series of Texts and Studies
M = Inscriptions of the Chams as numbered in MAJUMDAR 1985
NAK = National Archives, Kathmandu
NGMPP = Nepal-German Manuscript Preservation Project
NIC = *Nouvelles inscriptions du Cambodge* (I, II–III) (POU 1989, 2001)
SII = *South Indian Inscriptions*
SOAS = School of Oriental and African Studies, London
T = Devanāgarī transcript prepared for the IFI
Taishō = TAKAKUSU and WATANABE 1924–1929
ULC = University Library, Cambridge, U.K.

śaktas tāni maghavān bhettuṃ sarvāyudhair api / atha sarve 'marā rudraṃ jagmuḥ śaraṇam arditāḥ / te tam ūcur mahātmānaṃ sarve devāḥ savāsavāḥ / rudra raudrā bhaviṣyanti paśavaḥ sarvakarmasu / nipātayiṣyase cainān asurān bhuvaneśvara / sa tathoktas tathety uktvā devānāṃ hitakāmyayā. Then it has the following passage not found in any other recension according to the editors of the Poona critical edition: *śalyam agniṃ ca vai kṛtvā puṅkhe somam apāṃ patim / sa kṛtvā dhanur oṃkāraṃ sāvitrīṃ jyāṃ maheśvaraḥ / hayāṃś ca caturo vedān sarvavedamayaṃ ratham / prajāpatiṃ rathaśreṣṭhe viniyujya sa sārathim* before continuing as in *Mahābhārata* 7.173.56c–58: *atiṣṭhat sthāṇubhūtaḥ sa sahasraṃ parivatsarān / yadā trīṇi sametāni antarikṣe purāṇi vai / triparvaṇā triśalyena tena tāni bibheda saḥ / purāṇi na ca taṃ śekur dānavāḥ prativīkṣitum / śaraṃ kālāgnisaṃyuktaṃ viṣṇusomasamāyutam*. The unique passage has all the details of the Cham version if we accept that the inscription's Iḍāviriñca is the Epic's Prajāpati.

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

Bibliography

Manuscripts[351]

AGNIKĀRYAPADDHATI. A = Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, MS Sanscrit 505 C; paper; Śāradā; B = Göttingen, Cod. Ms. Mu. 1, 134; paper; Śāradā. Paddhati of the fire-sacrifice as performed by the Śaiva Gurus of Kashmir.

ANNAPŪRAPŪJĀ. BORI MS 252 of 1883–84, Pt. 3. Paper; Śāradā. See also CHANDRA 1984. The Kashmirian Śaiva Paddhati for the *annapūrapūjā/annapūripūjā* that precedes the Aṣṭakā fire-sacrifice (*śivāṣṭakā*) in the annual Śrāddha (*śivaśrāddham*).

'ĀNANDANĀTHA'. SOAS MS 44389. Paper; Śāradā. Kashmirian Maithila Śākta collectanea.

UTTARĀMNĀYAPAVITRĀROHAṆAVIDHI. NAK MS 1-70, NGMPP Reel No. B 177/30. Paper; Newari script. Newari and Sanskrit. Paddhati for the periodic ritual of offering Pavitras to Siddhilakṣmī and the other deities of the Northern Transmission.

UMĀTILAKA. Locus of attribution of *SIDDHILAKṢMĪSTAVA, q.v.

KALĀDĪKṢĀPADDHATI of Manodaguru/Manodadatta, expanded by Śivasvāmin. A = BORI Ms 157 of 1886–92; B = BORI Ms. 440 of 1875–76; C = BORI Ms. 1147 of 1886–92. Paddhati of the rituals of initiation and consecration as performed by the Śaiva Gurus of Kashmir.

KAŚMĪRATĪRTHASAṂGRAHA, BL MS Stein. Or. d. 2. Paper; Śāradā. Abstracts of information gathered by Paṇḍit Sāhib Rām (d. 1872) while preparing a never-completed descriptive survey of the ancient Tīrthas of Kashmir commissioned by Mahārāja Raṇbīr Singh (r. 1868–1885). See STEIN 1961, 2:283–385.

KIRAṆA. NAK MS 5-893, NGMPP Reel No. A 40/23 (= *Kiraṇatantra, Kiraṇāgama*). Nepalese "Licchavi" script; an incomplete palm-leaf MS of A.D. 924 of the Saiddhāntika scripture of this name. Contains text from 7.5c of VIVANTI 1975 to the end.

KRIYĀKĀLAGUṆOTTARA. NAK MS 3-392, NGMPP Reel No. B 25/3. Palm-leaf; Nepalese "Pāla" script; A.D. 1184/5. A Śaiva Tantra covering the subject-matter of the Gāruḍatantras and the Bhūtatantras.

KRIYĀSAṂGRAHAPADDHATI of Vāladhārin. Kathmandu, Kaiser Library MS. 63, NGMPP C 5/3. Palm-leaf; Nepalese Bhujimol script; Saṃvat 211 A.D. 1090/1. A Saiddhāntika Paddhati covering the daily duties, initiation, consecration to office (*abhiṣekaḥ*), cremation and the postmortuary rituals.

GAJAŚĀNTIMAHĀBALIVIDHI. NAK MS 1-1322, NGMPP Reel no. A 235/29. Paper; Newari script. Paddhati of a ritual sponsored by Jayabhūpatīndramalla, king of the independent kingdom of Bhaktapur, A.D. 1696–1722.

GOPRADĀNAVIDHI: *Gopradānavidhiḥ (śaivānāṃ rītyā)*. BL MS Stein Or. f. 2. Kashmirian Śaiva Paddhati for the postmortuary gift of a cow.

CIÑCIṆĪMATASĀRASAMUCCAYA. NAK MS 1-767, NGMPP Reel No. B 157/19. Paper; Newari script; A.D. 1754. A syncretistic Kaula scripture of the Western Tradition (*paścimāmnāyaḥ*).

JAYADRATHAYĀMALA, Ṣaṭka 4. NAK MS 1-1468, NGMPP Reel No. B 122/4. Paper; Newari script; A.D. 1671/2. A scripture of the Krama-based Kālīkula.

JÑĀNARATNĀVALĪ of Jñānaśivācārya. IFI MS T. 231. A 12th-century Saiddhāntika Paddhati written by a South-India Śaiva in Benares.

TANTRASĀRA of Kṛṣṇānanda. Banaras Hindu University Library MS Acc. No. C. 1028, wrongly catalogued (TRIPĀṬHĪ 1971) as the *Tantrasāra* of Abhinavagupta.

TALEJUSAKE THĀPŪJĀ YĀYA VIDHIḤ. NAK MS 4-220, NGMPP Reel No. 1230/9. Paper; Newari script; Newari and Sanskrit. A Paddhati for the *thāpūjā* of Taleju.

TUMBEŚVARĪPŪJĀPADDHATI. NAK MS 1-1696. Paper; Newari script; Newari and Sanskrit. A Paddhati for the worship of the Durgā Tumbeśvarī.

351. All sources are in Sanskrit unless otherwise stated.

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

TULAJĀCŪLIKĀSTHĀPANAVIDHI. NAK MS 1-168, NGMPP Reel No. 238/1. Paper; Newari script; Newari and Sanskrit. A Paddhati for a ceremony of installing a finial on a temple of Taleju.

TULAJĀTHĀPŪJĀVIDHI (in the text: *śrī 2 jayabhūpatīndramalladevanatayā thāpūjā*). NGMPP Reel No. E 1948/4. Paper; Newari script; Newari and Sanskrit. A Paddhati for the *thāpūjā* of Taleju.

TULAJĀDĪPADĀNAPŪJĀVIDHI (TALEJUSAKE MATĀPŪJĀVIDHI). NGMPP Reel No. E 1930/31. Paper; Newari script; Newari and Sanskrit. A Paddhati for the ritual of worshipping Taleju by presenting lamps.

DĪPTA. IFI MS T. 507, pp. 533–1051. A South-Indian Pratiṣṭhātantra under the title of a lost ancient Saiddhāntika scripture of that name. It is identified in its chapter colophons as the *Dīptaśāstra-Pratiṣṭhātantra*.

DEVYĀMATA. NAK MS 1-279, NGMPP Reel No. A 41/15 ('*Niśvāsākhyamahātantra*'). Palm-leaf; Nepalese "Licchavi" script. An early Saiddhāntika Śaiva Pratiṣṭhātantra, claiming to be a text of the *Bījabheda* of the *Niśvāsa*.

NAVARĀTRAPŪJĀ. NAK MS 1-220, NGMPP Reel No. A 240/17. Paper; Newari script; Newari and Sanskrit. A Paddhati for the rituals of the autumnal Navarātra festival.

NITYĀKAULA. NAK MS 2-226, NGMPP Reel No. B 26/21. Palm-leaf; Newari script; comprising ff. 2–3 and 6–13, breaking off in the course of the sixth Paṭala. Codex unicus. A Kaula scripture of the Nityā cult.

NITYĀDISAṂGRAHAPADDHATI compiled by Rājānaka Takṣakavarta. BORI MS No. 76 of 1875–76. Paper; Śāradā ('*Bhṛṅgeśasaṃhitā*': that is the locus of attribution of the last folio of a manuscript of the *Mṛtitattvānusmaraṇa* that has been placed at the end of this codex); codex unicus. This is evidently the exemplar of BL MS Stein Or. d. 43 ('*Nityādisaṃgrahābhidhānapaddhati*'). A Kashmirian digest of passages of Śaiva scriptures, Saiddhāntika and non-Saiddhāntika, pertaining to the regular and other Śaiva rituals.

NIŚVĀSAKĀRIKĀ. IFI MS T. 17. A later addition to the *Niśvāsa* group of Saiddhāntika scriptures. It includes the *Dīkṣottara* as its latter half.

NIŚVĀSAGUHYA. NAK MS 1-227, NGMPP Reel No. A 41/14 ('*Niśvāsatattvasaṃhitā*'), ff. 42r5–114v. Palm-leaf; Nepalese "Licchavi" script; *c.* A.D. 900. A very early Saiddhāntika scripture.

NIŚVĀSAMUKHA. NAK MS 1-227, NGMPP Reel No. A 41/14 ('*Niśvāsatattvasaṃhitā*'), ff. 1v–18v6. Details as for NIŚVĀSAGUHYA.

NAIMITTIKAKARMĀNUSAṂDHĀNA of Brahmaśambhu. ASB, MS G 4767. Palm-leaf; early Newari script; incomplete. The earliest surviving Saiddhāntika Paddhati, part of the *Brahmaśambhupaddhati*, covering initiation, consecration (of Sādhakas, Ācāryas and the king and queeen), the last rites (*antyeṣṭiḥ*) and Śrāddha.

PARĀTANTRA. Calcutta, ASB MS 4775 (G). Paper; Newari script. A Nepalese scripture of the Malla period concerning the worship of the goddesses of the Āmnāyas, principally Siddhilakṣmī (Pratyaṅgirā), Guhyakālī and Kubjikā.

PIṄGALĀMATA. NAK MS 3–376, NGMPP Reel No. A 42/2. Palm-leaf; Newari script; A.D. 1173/4. Also called *Jayadrathādhikāra*. An early Śaiva Pratiṣṭhātantra covering both Saiddhāntika and non-Saiddhāntika domains, which assigns itself to [the tradition of] the *Brahmayāmala*.

PICUMATA (/BRAHMAYĀMALA). NAK MS 3-370, NGMPP Reel No. A 42/6. Palm-leaf; early Newari script; 12 January A.D. 1052 (PETECH 1984, p. 44). The principal scripture of the Yāmala division of the Vidyāpīṭha.

PRATYAṄGIRĀPADDHATI. NAK MS 3-796, NGMPP Reel No. A 253/18. Paper; Newari script; Newari and Sanskrit. A Paddhati for the worship of Siddhilakṣmī, the fifty Kṣetrapālas, and the local deities of the wards of Bhaktapur.

PRĀYAŚCITTASAMUCCAYA of Trilocanaśiva. IFI MS T. 1060. A summary of the rules concerning penance and purification, drawing on various undeclared Saiddhāntika scriptural sources.

PRĀYAŚCITTASAMUCCAYA of Hrdayaśiva. Cambridge, University Library, MS Add. 2833. Palm-leaf; early Newari script; A.D. 1157/8. A digest of Śaiva scriptural treatments of penance.

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

BṚHATKĀLOTTARA. NAK MS 1-89, NGMPP Reel No. B 24/59 ('*Kālottaratantram*'). Palm-leaf; early Newari script; undated. A late eclectic Saiddhāntika scripture, probably of the tenth century.

BRĀHMAṆĀDIJĀTĪYAKAVARṆANA. BL, MS Stein. Or. c. 4. Paper; Śāradā. A short anonymous tract on the divisions of the Kashmirian brahmins.

BHĀVACŪḌĀMAṆI. Jammu, Raghunath Temple Library, ms. 5291, now in the collection of the Ranbir Research Institute, Jammu. Paper; Kashmirian Devanāgarī; codex unicus. A commentary on the *Mayasaṃgraha* by Vidyākaṇṭha, pupil of Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha II.

MAYASAṂGRAHA. NAK MS 1-1537, NGMPP Reel No. A 31/18. Palm-leaf; Newari script; incomplete; codex unicus. An early Saiddhāntika Śaiva Pratiṣṭhātantra.

MṚGENDRAPADDHATI of Aghoraśiva with the commentary (MṚGENDRAPADDHATIVYĀKHYĀ) of Vaktraśambhu. IFI MS T. 1021. A Saiddhāntika Paddhati based on the scripture *Mṛgendra*.

MOHACŪROTTARA. NAK MS 5-1977, NGMPP Reel No. A 182/2. Paper; Devanāgarī; copied from an old Nepalese palm-leaf manuscript. A Saiddhāntika Pratiṣṭhātantra.

RUDRAŚĀNTI. NGMPP Reel No. A 256/44, ff. 8v6–23v8. Newari and Sanskrit. A Paddhati for the Rudraśānti ritual.

REVANTAMAHĀBHAIRAVAPŪJĀVIDHI. NAK MS 1-625. Paper (*thyā saphū*); Newari script. Sanskrit and Newari. A Paddhati for a ritual on the occasion of the installation by King Bhūpatīndramalla of Bhaktapur of a gateway (*toraṇasthāpanam*) for the pleasure of Revanta (Revantamahābhairava), son of the Sun and protector of horses.

LAKṢAKOṬIHOMAPRAYOGA. Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin, Hs or 9484. Paper; Nepalese; Devanāgarī. Detailed instructions for the fire-sacrifices of 100,000 and 10,000,000 oblations, composed during the reign of Tribhuvan Bir Bikram Shah (r. A.D. 1911–1955).

VĪṆĀŚIKHA. NAK MS 1-1076; NGMPP Reel No. A 43/33. Palm-leaf; Nepalese 'Pāla' script; codex unicus. A Tantra of the Śaiva Vāmasrotas.

ŚĀRIKĀSTAVA of Sāhib Kaul. SOAS MS 44389 ('*Ānandanātha*'). Paper; Śāradā. ff. 1-5. A mystical hymn to the Kashmirian goddess Śārikā as the author's lineage-deity (*vaṃśadevī*).

ŚIVADHARMA. A = ULC MS Add. 1694 ('*Śivadharma etc.*'). Palm-leaf; earlier Newari script; undated; complete. Contains *Śivadharma*, *Śivadharmottara*, *Śivadharmasaṃgraha*, *Śivopaniṣad*, *Umāmaheśvarasaṃvāda*, *Uttarottara*, *Vṛṣasārasaṃgraha* and *Dharmaputrikā*; B = ULC MS Add. 1645 ('*Śivadharmatantra*'). Palm-leaf; earlier Newari script; A.D. 1139/40). Same contents.

ŚIVADHARMOTTARA. Part 2 of Wellcome Institute for the History of Medicine (London), South Asian Manuscript Collection, MS δ 16 ('*Śivadharmaśāstra*'); paper; Devanāgarī transcript of a Nepalese palm-leaf manuscript. Folios numbered from 63 to 143 in the right margin of each verso and from 1 to 80 in the left.

ŚYĀMĀPADDHATI of Sāhib Kaul. Photocopy of a manuscript from Jaipur, prepared when it was the property of Sam Fogg Rare Books and Manuscripts, 35 St. George Street, London. Paper; Devanāgarī. A Kashmirian Maithila Paddhati for the regular worship of Dakṣiṇā Kālī (Śyāmā).

ŚRĪVIDYĀNITYAPŪJĀPADDHATI of Sāhib Kaul. BL, MS Chandra Shum Shere e. 264 ('Tantric Collectanea'), ff. 1[=227]v1–156[=382]v. Paper; Śāradā. A Kashmirian Maithila Paddhati for the regular worship of Tripurasundarī (Śrīvidyā).

ŚRĪVIDYĀMANTRAVIVṚTI of Upādhyāya Śivarāmasvāmin. Staats-Bibliothek zu Berlin, Ms. 166 (Janert MS Ka 663), ff. 1[37]r–47[74]r; paper; Śāradā script. A late Kashmirian tract in about 700 granthas showing that the Śivādvaita is supported by the Upaniṣads and that both Tantric and Vedic Mantras (the Saubhāgyavidyā and the Gāyatrī) share the same Śaiva meaning and reality.

SAMAYĀCĀRATANTRA. BL, MS Chandra Shum Shere d. 363 (vi). Paper; Devanāgarī. A scripture on the Kaula rites and observances.

SARVAJÑĀNOTTARA. A = NAK MS 1-1692, NGMPP Reel No. A 43/12. Palm-leaf; early Nepalese "Licchavi" script; undated but probably tenth century. B = IFI MS T. 334. An early Saiddhāntika Śaiva scripture.

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

SIDDHANTASĀRAPADDHATI of Mahārājādhirāja Bhojadeva. NAK MS 1-1363, NGMPP Reel No. B 28/29. Palm-leaf; early Newari script; A.D. 1077/8. A Saiddhāntika Śaiva Paddhati covering the rituals of regular worship, initiation, installation and renovation.

SIDDHILAKṢMĪMANTRAYANTRODDHĀRĀDISTOTRA of King Jitāmitramalla (r. 1673–1696) of Bhaktapur. in *Uttarāmnāyapavitrārohaṇavidhi*, NAK MS 1-70, NGMPP Reel No. A 253/18, ff. 42v7–44r7. Paper; Newari script.

*SIDDHILAKṢMĪSTAVA. A hymn to Siddhilakṣmī in twelve Śārdūlavikrīḍita verses at the beginning of an inscription in Sanskrit and Newari in the wall of the temple of Pūrṇacaṇḍī in Patan, Nepal, recording a restoration (*jīrṇoddhāraḥ*) of the temple in 1854. The inscription attributes the hymn to the *Umātilaka* (l. 12: *ity umātilake siddhilakṣmyāḥ stavaḥ*). Photograph.

SOMAŚAMBHUPADDHATIVYĀKHYĀ of Trilocanaśiva. IFP MS T. 170. A commentary on the *Karmakāṇḍakramāvalī* of Somaśambhu (*Somaśambhupaddhati*).

SPANDAPRADĪPIKĀ of Bhaṭṭārakasvāmin. BORI Ms. No. 513 of 1875–76 ('*Spandapradīpa*'). Paper; Śāradā. A commentary on the *Spandakārikā*.

SVACCHANDA: *Svacchandalalitabhairavatantra*. NAK MS 1-224, NGMPP Reel No. B 28/18. Palm-leaf; early Newari script; A.D. 1068/9. The principal scripture of the Śaiva Dakṣiṇasrotas.

SVACCHANDABHAIRAVAKRAMAMAHĀSARVAŚĀNTIVIDHĀNA. NGMPP Reel No. A 256/44, ff. 1v–8v5. Newari and Sanskrit. A Paddhati for a Śānti ritual addressed to Svacchandabhairava.

HRLLEKHĀPADDHATI of Sāhib Kaul. BL. MS Chandra Shum Shere g. 27. Paper; Śāradā. A Kashmirian Maithila Paddhati for the regular worship of Bhuvaneśvarī.

Published Sources

AGNIPURĀṆA, ed. Āchārya Baladeva Upādhyāya. Kashi Sanskrit Series, 174. Varanasi: CSS Office, 1966.

AJITĀGAMA, ed. N.R. Bhatt. 2 vols. Publications de l'IFI, No. 24. Pondicherry: IFI, 1964 and 1967.

ATHARVAVEDAPARIŚIṢṬA: *The Pariśiṣṭas of the Atharvaveda*, ed. George Melville Bolling and Julius von Negelein. Leipzig: Otto Harrassowitz, 1909–1912.

AMARAKOŚA, ed. A.A. Ramanathan with the commentaries of Liṅgayasūri (AMARAPADAVIVRTI) and Mallinātha (AMARAPADAPĀRIJĀTA). The Adyar Library Series, vol. 101. Madras: The Adyar Library and Research Centre, 1989. Reprint of first edition of 1971.

ARJUNAWIJAYA of Mpu Tantular. See SUPOMO 1977. Old Javanese.

AVADĀNAŚATAKA, ed. P.L. Vaidya. Bauddha-Saṃskṛta-Granthāvalī, no. 19. Darbhanga: Mithila Institute of Post-Graduate Studies and Research in Sanskrit Learning, 1958.

ĀGAMARAHASYA (UTTARĀRDHA) of Paṇḍita Sarayūprasāda Dvivedī, ed. Gaṅgādhara Dvivedī. Rājasthāna-Purātana-Granthamālā, No. 110. Jodhpur: Rājasthāna-Prācyavidyā- Pratiṣṭhāna, 1969.

ĀDIPURĀṆA, ed. Yasuke IKARI and Takao HAYASHI in IKARI 1994, 83–136.

ĀPASTAMBAŚRAUTASŪTRA with the commentary of Rudradatta, ed. Richard Garbe. 2nd ed. with new appendix containing corrections and emendations to the text by C.G. Kashikar. Bibliotheca Indica, No. 92. New Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal, 1983.

ĪŚĀNAŚIVAGURUDEVAPADDHATI: the *Siddhāntasāra* of Īśānaśivagurudeva, ed. T. Gaṇapati Sastri. Trivandrum Sanskrit Series, 69 (*Sāmānyapādaḥ*), 72 (*Mantrapādaḥ* = *Tantrasāraḥ*); 77 (*Kriyāpādaḥ* pt. 1) and 83 (*Kriyāpādaḥ* pt. 2, and *Yogapādaḥ*). Trivandrum, 1920, 1921, 1922, 1925.

UDDHĀRAKOŚA: Raghu Vira and Shodo Taki (ed.), *Dakṣiṇāmūrti's Uddhāra-kośa. A dictionary of the secret Tantric syllabic code*. 2nd edition. New Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal: 1978. Reprinted from the edition of 1938.

KATHĀSARITSĀGARA of Somadeva, ed. Paṇḍit Jagadīś Lāl Śāstrī. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1970.

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

KARPŪRĀDISTOTRAṬĪKĀ of Vimalānandasvāmin: Karpūrādistotram with Introduction and Commentary by Vimalānanda Svāmī translated by Arthur Avalon. Tantrik Texts, vol. IX. London: Luzac, 1922.

KARMAKĀṆḌAKRAMĀVALI of Somaśambhu, ed. Pandit Jagaddhar Zadou. KSTS, No. 58. Srinagar, 1947. = *Somaśambhupaddhati*.

KĀTYĀYANASMṚTI, text reconstructed and trans. with notes and introd. by P.V. Kane. Bombay: P.V. Kane, 1933.

KATHĀSARITSĀGARA of Somadeva, ed. Paṇḍit Jagadīś Lāl Śāstrī. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1970.

MAHĀKĀLASAṂHITĀ (KĀMAKALĀKHAṆḌA), ed. Umesh Mishra and Gopinatha Kaviraja. Rashtriya Sanskrit Samsthan Series, No. I. Allahabad: Gaṅgānātha Jhā Kendriya Saṃskṛta Vidyāpīṭha, 1971.

KIRAṆA. See GOODALL 1998 and VIVANTI 1975.

KULACŪḌĀMAṆITANTRA, ed. Girīsha Chandra Vedāntatīrtha. Tantrik Texts, vol. 4. London: Luzac, 1915.

KULĀRṆAVATANTRA, ed. Tārānātha Vidyāratna. Tantrik Texts, vol. 5. London: Luzac, 1917.

KŪRMAPURĀṆA, ed. Ananda Swarup Gupta. Varanasi: All-India Kashiraj Trust, 1971.

KṚTYAKALPATARU of Lakṣmīdhara, ed. K.V. Rangaswami Aiyangar. GOS, No. 106. Baroda: Oriental Institute, 1948.

GAṆAKĀRIKĀ with the commentary RATNAṬĪKĀ, ed. C.D. Dalal. GOS, No. 15. Baroda: Central Library, 1920.

GUPTASĀDHANATANTRA, ed. Puṇyaśīla Śarmā. Guptāvatāradurlabhatantramālā, Caturtha-varṣa-maṇi 5. Prayāga: Kalyāṇamandira, [VS] 2027 (= A.D. 1970).

GORAKṢAŚATAKA, ed. Fausta Nowotny. Dokumente der Geistesgeschichte, 3. Köln: K.A. Nowotny, 1976.

CATURVARGACINTĀMAṆI: *Caturvargacintāmaṇi of Hemādri*, ed. Paṇḍita Bharatacandra Śiromaṇi. 7 volumes. Kashi Sanskrit Series, No. 235. Varanasi: Chaukhamba Sanskrit Sansthan, 1985. Reprinted from the 1911 edition of the ASB.

JAYĀKHYASAṂHITĀ, ed. Embar Krishnamacharya. GOS, No. 54. Baroda: Oriental Institute, 1967.

JÑĀNASIDDHĀNTA. See SOEBADIO 1971. Old Javanese and Sanskrit. A compendium of Śaiva materials edited from Balinese manuscripts.

JVĀLĀMUKHĪPŪJĀPADDHATI. Among the Pariśiṣṭas of the DEVĪRAHASYA.

TANTRASĀRASAṂGRAHA of Nārāyaṇa of Śivapura, also called *Viṣanārāyaṇīya*, ed. Duraiswami Aiyangar. Vrajajivan Prachyabharati Granthamala 62. Delhi: Chowkhamba, 1992.

TANTRĀLOKA of Abhinavagupta with the commentary (TANTRĀLOKAVIVEKA) of Rājānaka Jayaratha, ed. Mukund Rām Śāstrī. KSTS 23, 28–30, 35–36, 41, 47, 52, 57–59. Bombay and Srinagar, 1918–38.

TOḌALATANTRA, ed. Gopinatha Kaviraja. In *Tantrasaṅgraha*, Part II, pp. 53–94. Yogatantra-granthamālā, no. 4. Vārāṇasī: Vārāṇaseyasaṃskṛtaviśvavidyālaya, 1970.

DEVĪNĀMAVILĀSA of Sāhib Kaul, ed. Madhusūdan Kaul Shāstrī. KSTS 63 [Srinagar], 1942.

DEVĪRAHASYA with Pariśiṣṭas, ed. Ram Chandra Kak and Harabhaṭṭa Shastri. Delhi: Chaukhamba Sanskrit Pratishthan, 1993. Reprint of KSTS edition, Srinagar. 1941.

DEŚAWARṆANA of Mpu Prapañca. See PIGEAUD 1960–63; and ROBSON 1995. Old Javanese.

NĀRADASMṚTI, ed. Richard W. Lariviere: *The Nāradasmṛti critically edited with an introduction, annotated translation, and appendices*. University of Pennsylvania Studies on South Asia, Vols 4–5. Philadelphia: Dept. of South Asia Regional Studies, University of Pennsylvania, 1989.

NĪLAMATA, ed. K. de Vreese. Leiden: Brill, 1936.

NETRATANTRA with the commentary (NETRODDYOTA) by Kṣemarāja, ed. Madhusūdan Kaul Śāstrī. KSTS 46, 59. Bombay, 1926, 1939.

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

NEPĀLAMĀHĀTMYA, ed. Kedāranātha Sharmā. Chaukhamba Amarabharati Granthamala, 10. Varanasi: Chaukhamba Amarabharati Prakashan. 1977.

PAÑCĀRTHABHĀṢYA: *Pāśupatasūtra* (= *Pañcārtha*) with the commentary (*-bhāṣya*) of Kauṇḍinya, ed. R. Anantakrishna Sastri. Trivandrum Sanskrit Series, No. 118. Trivandrum: The Oriental Manuscript Library of the University of Travancore, 1940.

PARAMASAṂHITĀ, ed. and trans. S. Krishnaswami Aiyangar. GOS, No. 86. Baroda: Oriental Institute, 1940.

PARĀKHYA. See GOODALL 2001.

PARĀTANTRA, ed. Lt.-Col. Śrī Dhan Shum Shere Jung Bahādur Rāṇā. Prayāg: Caṇḍī Kāryālaya, VS 2016.

PĀDMASAṂHITĀ, ed. Seetha Padmanabhan and R. N. Sampath. Pañcarātra Pariśodhanā Pariṣad Series, Nos 3–4. Madras: Pañcarātra Pariśodhana Pariṣad, 1974 and 1982.

PRATIṢṬHĀMAYŪKHA of Nīlakaṇṭhabhaṭṭa. Lithograph. Bombay, 1862. Part of the *Bhagavantabhāskara*.

PHEṬKĀRIṆĪTANTRA, ed. Gopinatha Kaviraja. In *Tantrasaṅgraha*, Part II, pp. 161–306. Yogatantra-granthamālā, no. 4. Vārāṇasī: Vārāṇaseyasaṃskṛtaviśvavidyālaya, 1970.

BĀLĀPŪJĀPADDHATI. Among the Pariśiṣṭas of the DEVĪRAHASYA.

BṚHATSAṂHITĀ of Varāhamihira with the commentary (-VIVṚTI) of Bhaṭṭotpala, ed. A.V. Tripāṭhī. Sarasvatībhavangranthamālā, 97. Varanasi, 1988.

BṚHASPATISMṚTI (reconstructed), ed. K.V. Rangaswami Aiyangar. GOS, No. 85. Baroda: Oriental Institute, 1941.

BAUDHĀYANADHARMASŪTRA, ed. Cinnasvāmiśāstrī. Kashi Sanskrit Series, Karmakāṇḍa Section, No. 11. Benares: CSS Office, 1991.

BRAHMAPURĀṆA, ed. Peter Schreiner and Renate Söhnen. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1987.

BRAHMASŪTRABHĀṢYA of Bhāskara, ed. Pandit Vindhyesvarī Prasāda Dvivedin. CSS, Nos 70, 185 and 209. Benares: Chowkhamba Sanskrit Book Depot, 1915.

BHAṬṬIKĀVYA, ed. and trans. Maheshwar Anant Karandikar and Shailaja Karandikar. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1982.

MAÑJUŚRĪMŪLAKALPA: *Āryamañjuśrīmūlakalpa*, ed. T. Gaṇapati Śāstrī, Trivandrum Sanskrit Series, nos 70, 76 and 84. Trivandrum: The Oriental Manuscript Library of the University of Travancore, 1920, 1922 and 1925. Reprinted by P.L. Vaidya as Buddhist Sanskrit Texts, no. 18 (one volume), Darbhanga: Mithila Institute, 1964.

MATAṄGA: *Mataṅgapārameśvarāgama, Vidyāpāda*, with the commentary (MATAṄGAVṚTTI) of Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha, ed. N.R. Bhatt. Publications de l'IFI, Pondicherry, No. 66. Pondicherry: IFI, 1977; *Mataṅgapārameśvarāgama, Kriyāpāda, Yogapāda* and *Caryāpāda*, with the commentary (MATAṄGAVṚTTI) of Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha up to *Kriyāpāda* 11.12b, ed. N.R. Bhatt. Publications de l'IFI, Pondicherry, No. 65. Pondicherry: IFI, 1982.

MATSYAPURĀṆA. Ānandāśramagranthāvali, No. 54. Poona: Ānandāśrama Press, 1907.

MANUSMṚTI with the commentary (MANVARTHAMUKTĀVALĪ) of Kullūkabhaṭṭa, ed. J.L. Shastri. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1996. Second reprint of the 1983 edition.

—— with the commentary (*Manubhāṣya*) of Medhātithi. Ed. Gaṅgānātha Jhā. 3 vols. Bibliotheca Indica, 256. Calcutta: ASB, 1932 (vol. 1), 1939 (vols 2–3).

MAHĀBALASŪTRA, ed. and trans. F.A. Bischoff: *Contribution à l'étude des divinités mineures du bouddhisme tantrique: Ārya Mahābalanāma-Mahāyānasūtra, tibétain (mss. de Touen-Houang) et chinois*. Series Buddhica, Première série, Mémoires, 10. Paris: P. Geuthner, 1956.

MAHĀBHĀRATA, ed. V. Sukthankar et al. and (since 1943) S. Belvalkar. 19 volumes. Poona: BORI, 1933–1966.

MĀLINĪVIJAYOTTARA: *Mālinīvijayottaratantra*, ed. Madhusūdan Kaul. KSTS 37. Srinagar, 1922.

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

MITĀKṢARĀ. See YĀJÑAVALKYASMṚTI.

MṚGENDRA: *Mṛgendratantra*, *Vidyāpāda* and *Yogapāda*, with the commentary (-VṚTTI) of Bhaṭṭa Nārāyaṇakaṇṭha, ed. Madhusūdan Kaul Śāstrī. KSTS 50. Srinagar, 1930; MṚGENDRA: *Mṛgendrāgama* (= *Mṛgendratantra*), *Kriyāpāda* and incomplete *Caryāpada*, with the commentary (-VṚTTI) of Bhaṭṭa Nārāyaṇakaṇṭha, ed. N.R. Bhatt. Publications de l'IFI, No. 23. Pondicherry: IFI, 1962.

YĀJÑAVALKYASMṚTI with the commentary (MITĀKṢARĀ) of Vijñāneśvara, ed. Wasudev Laxman Sastri Pansikar. Bombay, 1926.

RAGHUVAṂŚA of Kālidāsa with the commentary (SAṂJĪVANĪ) of Mallinātha, ed. Narayan Ram Acharya. Bombay: Satyabhamabai Pandurang, 1948. Reprint: Chaukhamba Rajmata Series, No. 4. Varanasi/Delhi: Chaukhamba Orientalia, 1987.

RĀMĀYAṆA. See KERN 1900. Old Javanese.

RAURAVASŪTRASAṂGRAHA, ed. N.R. Bhatt in *Rauravāgama*, vol. 1. Publications de l'IFI, No. 18. Pondicherry: IFI, 1985. Parts of this scripture are published here as the whole work, as *Rauravāgama*, *Vidyāpāda*, Paṭalas 1–10 (pp. 1–16, 173–194).

RAURAVĀGAMA, ed. N.R. Bhatt. 3 vols. Publications de l'IFI, No. 18. Pondicherry: IFI, 1961, 1972 and 1985.

LAKṢMĪTANTRA, ed. Pandit V. Krishnamacharya. The Adyar Library Series, Vol. 87. Madras: Adyar Library and Research Centre, 1959.

LIṄGAPURĀṆA with the commentary (ŚIVATOṢIṆĪ) of Gaṇeśa Nātu, ed. Gaṅgāviṣṇu. Bombay: Venkatesvara Press, 1924. Reprinted, Delhi: Nag Publishers, 1989 and 1996.

VIṢṆUDHARMOTTARA, ed. Kṣemarāja Kṛṣṇadāsa. Delhi: Nag Publishers, 1985. Reprint of 1912 edition (Bombay: Venkatesvara Steam Press).

VĪṆĀŚIKHA. See GOUDRIAAN 1985.

VAIKHĀNASADHARMASŪTRA, ed. K. Rangachari. Ramanujachari Oriental Institute Publication, vol. 3. Madras: Diocesan Press, 1930.

ŚATAPAÑCĀŚATKA of Mātṛceṭa: The Śatapañcāśatka of Mātṛceṭa. Sanskrit text, Tibetan translation & commentary and Chinese translation, ed. and trans. D.R. Shackleton Bailey. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1951.

ŚAVASŪTAKĀŚAUCAKĀLAPRAKARAṆA of Bhavadeva, ed. and trans. Rājendracandra Hajāra. Calcutta Sanskrit College Research Series, Nos. 4 and 6. Calcutta: Sanskrit College, 1959.

ŚĀṄKHĀYANAGṚHYASŪTRA, ed. Sitarama Sahagal. Sri Garib Das Oriental Series, No. 42. Delhi: Sri Satguru Publications, 1987.

ŚIVAPURĀṆA, ed. Khemarāja (son of Kṛṣṇadāsa). Bombay: Venkatesvara Press, V.S. 2011 [= A.D. 1954].

ŚLOKAVĀRTIKA: Kumārila Bhaṭṭa's versified clarification of the *Tarkapāda* of the *Mīmāṃsāsūtrabhāṣya* of Śabarasvāmin with the commentary (NYĀYARATNĀKARA) of Pārthasārathimiśra, ed. Dvārikādāsa Śāstrī. Prāchyabhāratī Series, No. 10. Varanasi: Tara Publications, 1978.

SACCARITRARAKṢĀ of Vedāntadeśika, ed. Aṇṇaṃgarācārya. Kāñcī: Granthamālākāryālaya, 1947. Published with the *Tattvaṭīkā*, *Nikṣeparakṣā*, *Pañcarātrarakṣā*, *Bhūgolanirṇaya* and other works as volume 3 of the section of commentaries in the *Śrīmadvedāntadeśikagranthamālā*.

SATKARMARATNĀVALĪ of Mahārājādhirāja Gīrvāṇayuddhavīravikramaśāhadeva, ed. Rāmanātha Ācārya and Dāmodara Koirālā. 2 parts. Kathmandu: Śrī 5 Ko Sarakārako Chāpākhānā, VS 2026, 2029.

SARVOLLĀSA: *Sarvollāsatantra* of Sarvānandanātha, ed. Rāsamohana Cakravartī, Calcutta: Herambacandra Bhaṭṭācārya, 1953. Forward by Gopinatha Kaviraj and introduction by Dineshchandra Bhattacharyya, both in English.

SĀTVATASAṂHITĀ with the commentary (-BHĀṢYA) of Alaśiṅgabhaṭṭa, ed. Vraja Vallabha Dwivedi. Library Rare Texts Publication Series, No. 6. Varanasi, 1982.

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

SĀRDHATRIŚATIKĀLOTTARAVṚTTI of Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha, ed. N.R. Bhatt: *Sārdhatriśatikālottarāgama avec le commentaire de Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha: édition critique*. Publications de l'IFI, No. 61. Pondicherry: IFI, 1979.

SUVARṆABHĀSOTTAMASŪTRA, ed. Johannes Nobel (*Suvarṇaprabhāsottamasūtra: Das Goldglanz-Sūtra; ein Sanskrittext des Mahāyāna-Buddhismus nach den Handschriften und mit Hilfe der tibetischen und chinesischen Übertragungen*). Leipzig: Harrassowitz, 1937.

SŪRYASEVANA. See HOOYKAAS 1966. Balinese.

SOMAŚAMBHUPADDHATI. See BRUNNER-LACHAUX 1963–1998.

SKANDAPURĀṆA: *Skandapurāṇasya Ambikākhaṇḍaḥ*, ed. Kṛṣṇaprasāda Bhaṭṭarāī. Mahendraratnagranthamālā 2. Kathmandu: Mahendrasaṃskṛtaviśvavidyālayaḥ, 1988. The original *Skandapurāṇa* surviving in Nepalese MSS, of which the earliest (NAK MS 2-229, NGMPP Reel No. B 11/4) was completed in A.D. 810.

SKANDAPURĀṆA, ed. Kṣemarāja Śrīkṛṣṇadāsa. Bombay: Venkatesvara Steam Press, V.S. 1967.

STUTIKUSUMĀÑJALILAGHUPAÑCIKĀ of Rājānaka Ratnakaṇṭha. Published with separate pagination after p. 526 of *Stutikusumāñjali*, ed. Premavallabha Tripāṭhi (Banaras: Acyutagranthamālā, V.S. 2021).

SVACCHANDA: *Svacchandatantra* with the commentary (SVACCHANDODDYOTA) of Rājānaka Kṣemarāja, ed. Madhusūdan Kaul Śāstrī. KSTS 31, 38, 44, 48, 51, 53, 56. Bombay, 1921–35.

SVĀYAMBHUVASŪTRASAṂGRAHA, ed. Veṅkaṭasubrahmaṇyaśāstrī. Mysore: Rājakīyaśākhāmudrālaya, 1937.

HARACARITACINTĀMAṆI of Rājānaka Jayadratha, ed. Paṇḍita Śivadatta and Kāśīnāth Pāṇḍurang Parab. Kāvyamālā, 61. Bombay, 1897.

Studies and Translations

ABÉ, Ryūichi. 1999. *The Weaving of Mantra. Kūkai and the Construction of Esoteric Buddhist Discourse*. New York: Columbia University Press.

ACKER, R. 1998. "New Geographic Tests of the Hydraulic Thesis at Angkor". *South East Asia Research* 6, 1: 5–47.

ADRIAENSEN, R. BAKKER, H.T and ISAACSON, H. 1998. *The Skandapurāṇa. Volume 1. Adhyāyas 1–25. Critically Edited with Prolegomena and English Synopsis*. Groningen: Egbert Forsten, 1998.

APPADORAI, A. 1990. *Economic Conditions in Southern India (1000–1500 A.D.* 2 volumes. Madras: University of Madras.

AUFRECHT, Th. 1864. *Catalogi Codicum Manuscriptorum Bibliothecae Bodleianae Pars Octava Codices Sanscriticos Complectens*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

AYMONIER, E. 1891. *Les Tchams et leurs religions*. Paris: Leroux.

BAKKER, Hans. 1997. *The Vākāṭakas. An Essay in Hindu Iconology*. Gonda Indological Series, vol. 5. Groningen: Egbert Forsten.

BALASUBRAHMANYAM, S.R. 1971. *Early Chola Temples. Parantaka I to Rajaraja I (A.D. 907–985)*. Bombay: Orient Longman.

BANERJI, S.C. 1992. *Tantra in Bengal. A Study of its Origin, Development and Influence*. New Delhi: Manohar Publications.

BARRETT JONES, Antoinette M. 1984. *Early Tenth Century Java from the Inscriptions. A Study of Economic, Social and Administrative Conditions in the First Quarter of the Century*. Dordrecht-Holland/Cinnaminson-U.S.A.: Foris.

BARTH, Auguste. 1888. *Inscriptions sanscrites du Cambodge*. Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres, Notices et extraits des manuscripts de la Bibliothèque nationale et autres bibliothèques, vol. 27, no. 1, 1–180, Paris.

BEAL, Samuel. Trans. 1884. *Si-yu-ki. Buddhist Records of the Western World*. London: Trübner.

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

BÉNISTI, Mireille. 1976. "Notes d'iconographie khmère". *Arts Asiatiques* 33, 25–57.

BERGAIGNE, Abel. 1893. *Inscriptions sanscrites de Campā et du Cambodge*. Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres, Notices et extraits des manuscripts de la Bibliothèque nationale et autres bibliothèques, vol. 27, no. 2, 181–632, Paris.

BHANDARKAR, D.R. 1909. "Lakulīśa". *Archaeological Survey of India, Annual Report: 1906–7*, 179–192.

BHATTACHARYA G. 1956. "Nandin and Vṛṣabha". *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, Suppl. III, 2, 1545–1567, 7 pls. (Vortrag, XIX. Deutscher Orientalistentag, Freiburg).

BHATTACHARYA, K. 1956. "Notes d'iconographie khmère". *Arts Asiatiques* 3, 183–194.

—— 1957. "Notes d'iconographie khmère". *Arts Asiatiques* 4, 208–298.

—— 1958. "Notes d'iconographie khmère". *Arts Asiatiques* 5, 217–220.

—— 1961. *Les religions brahmaniques dans l'ancien Cambodge d'après l'épigraphie et l'iconographie*, Publications de l'EFEO, vol. 49. Paris: EFEO.

—— 1967. "À propos de *niṣkalaliṅga*". *Journal Asiatique* 255, 227–229.

BISSCHOP, Peter. 2004. Early Śaivism and the *Skandapurāṇa*. Sects and Centres. Doctoral Dissertation. Rijksuniversiteit Groningen.

BOISSELIER, Jean. 1955. *La Statuaire khmère et son évolution*. Publications de l'EFEO. Saigon: EFEO.

BOSCH, F.D.K. 1925. "Het Liṅga-Heiligdom van Dinaja". *Tijdschrift Bataviaasch Genootschap voor Kunsten en Wetenschappen* 64, pp. 227–286.

BROUGH, J. 1953. *The Early Brahmanical System of Gotra and Pravara. A Translation of the Gotra-Pravara-Mañjarī of Puruṣottama-Paṇḍita*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

BRUNNER-LACHAUX, Hélène. Ed. and trans. 1963, 1968, 1977, 1998. *Somaśambhupaddhati*. 4 vols. *Première Partie: Le rituel quotidien dans la tradition śivaïte de l'Inde du Sud selon Somaśambhu; Deuxième Partie: Rituels occasionnels dans la tradition śivaïte de l'Inde du Sud selon Somaśambhu I: Pavitrārohaṇa, Damanapūjā et Prāyaścitta; Troisième Partie: Rituels occasionnels dans la tradition śivaïte de l'Inde du Sud selon Somaśambhu II: dīkṣā, abhiṣeka, vratoddhāra, antyeṣṭi, śrāddha; Quatrième Partie: rituels optionnels: pratiṣṭhā*. Publications de l'IFI No. 25. Pondicherry: IFI.

—— 1968. "Toujours le *niṣkalaliṅga*". *Journal Asiatique* 256, 445–447.

BÜHLER, Georg. 1877. *A Detailed Report of a Tour in Search of Sanskrit Manuscripts in Kaśmīr, Rajaputana, and Central India*. Journal of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society, vol. 12; extra no. 34A. Bombay.

CABATON, A. 1901. *Nouvelles recherches sur les Chams*. Paris: Publications de l'EFEO.

CHAKRAVARTI, Adhir. 1982. *Royal Succession in Ancient Cambodia*. The Asiatic Society Monograph Series, 26. Calcutta: The Asiatic Society.

CHANDRA, Lokesh. Reprod. 1984. *Sanskrit Texts from Kashmir, Volume 7*. Śata-piṭaka Series, Indo-Asian Literatures, No. 333. New Delhi: Sharada Rani. This is a photographic reproduction of Kashmirian Paddhatis published in Devanāgarī. Pp. 127–247 are *Sāṅgopāṅga-viṣṇubalividhi-sāṅgaśaivīkriyātmakaṃ Karmakāṇḍam. Caturthapustakam* (Paṇḍita Keśavabhaṭṭa Jyotirvid [Keshav Bhat Zutish], ed., Bombay: 1936), which contains the Paddhati of the Śaiva funerary and postfunerary rituals.

CŒDÈS, George. 1911. "Les bas-reliefs d'Angkor-Vat". *Bulletin de la commission archéologique de l'Indochine*, 170–220.

—— 1923. *Bronzes Khmèrs. Étude basée sur des documents receuillis par M.P. Lefèvre-Pontalis dans les collections publiques et privées de Bangkok et sur les pièces conservées au palais royal de Phnom Penh, au musée du Cambodge, et au musée de l'École Française d'Extrême-Orient. Ars Asiatica*, 5. Paris et Bruxelles: Librairie Nationale d'Art et d'Histoire.

—— 1929. "Études Cambodgiennes: 23. La date du temple de Bantay Srei, 24. Nouvelles données chronologiques et généalogiques sur la dynastie de Mahīdharapura". *BEFEO* 29, 289–330.

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

—— 1937–1966. *Inscriptions du Cambodge*. 8 vols. Paris: EFEO. 1937 (vol. 1), 1942 (vol. 2), 1951 (vol. 3), 1952 (vol. 4), 1953 (vol. 5), 1954 (vol. 6), 1964 (vol. 7), 1966 (vol. 8).

—— 1939. "Une statue de Çiva récemment découverte à Bâkoṅ (Cambodge)". *BEFEO* 39, 221–222 (republished in CŒDÈS 1992, 117–118).

—— 1968. *The Indianized States of Southeast Asia*. Honolulu: The University Press of Hawaii. Translation of CŒDÈS, *Les États hindouisés d'Indochine et de l'Indonésie*, Paris, 1964.

—— 1992. *Articles sur le pays khmer*, vol. 2. Paris: EFEO.

CŒDÈS, George and DUPONT, Pierre. 1943–46. "Les stèles de Sdok Kāk Thoṃ, Phnoṃ Sandak et Práḥ Vihār." *BEFEO* 43: 56-154. Reprinted in *George Cœdès. Articles sur le pays khmer:* (Paris: EFEO, 1992), vol. 2, pp. 167–265.

DE CASPARIS, J.G. and MABBETT, I.W. 1992. "Religion and Popular Beliefs of Southeast Asia before c. 1500". In TARLING 1992, 276–339.

DEMIÉVILLE, Paul. 1929–30. "Bishamon" in *Hôbôgirin. Dictionnaire encyclopédique du bouddhisme d'après les sources chinoises et japonaises*, Tokyo: Maison Franco-Japonaise, fasc. 1, pp. 79a–83b.

DERRETT, J. Duncan M. Ed. 1975. *Bhāruci's Commentary on the Manusmṛti: The Manu-Śāstra-Vivarana. Books 6–12: text, translation, and notes*. Schriftenreihe des Südasien-Instituts der Universität Heidelberg, Bd. 18. Wiesbaden: F. Steiner.

DUTT, Nalinaksha. 1939. *Gilgit Manuscripts. Volume 1*. Srinagar, Kashmir.

VAN EERDE, J.C. 1910. "Hindu-Javaansche en Balinische Eredienst". *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde van de Koninklijke Instituut* 65, 1–39.

ENGLISH, Elizabeth. 2002. *Vajrayoginī. Her Visualizations, Rituals, and Forms. A Study of the Cult of Vajrayoginī in India*. Boston: Wisdom Publications.

FONTEIN, Jan with essays by R. SOEKMONO and Edi SEDYAWATI. 1990. *The Sculpture of Indonesia*. Washington: National Gallery of Art.

FREEMAN, Michael and JACQUES, Claude. 1999. *Ancient Angkor*. London: Thames and Hudson.

FULLER, 1976. *The Nayars Today*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

GAIL, Adalbert J. 1984–8. *Tempel in Nepal*. Graz: Akademische Druck- u. Verlagsanstalt. Vol. 1 (1984): *Ikonographie hinduistischer Pagoden in Patan Kathmandutal*; vol. 2 (1988): *Ikonographische Untersuchungen zur späten Pagode und zum Sikhara-Tempel*.

GEERTZ, Clifford. 1980. *Negara: The Theatre State in Nineteenth-century Bali*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

GELLNER, David. 1992. *Monk, Householder, and Tantric Priest: Newar Buddhism and its Hierarchy of Ritual*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

GITEAU, Madeleine. 1976. *The Civilization of Angkor*. New York: Rizzoli, 1976. Translated by Katherine Watson from the French: *Angkor: Un peuple - Un art*, Fribourg: Office du livre, 1976.

GOODALL, Dominic. Ed. and trans. 1998. *Bhaṭṭarāmakaṇṭhaviracitā kiraṇavṛttiḥ. Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha's Commentary on the Kiraṇatantra. Vol. 1: chapters 1–6. Critical Edition and Annotated Translation*. Publications du département d'Indologie, 86.1. Pondicherry: Institut Français de Pondichéry / EFEO.

—— 2001. *The Parākhyatantra. A Scripture of the Śaiva Siddhānta. A Critical Edition and Annotated Translation*. Habilitation thesis submitted to the University of Hamburg, 2001. Forthcoming.

GOUDRIAAN, T. 1973. "Tumburu and His Sisters". *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens* 17, 49–95.

—— Ed. and trans. 1985. *The Vīṇāśikhatantra: A Śaiva Tantra of the Left Current*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.

GOUDRIAAN, T. and SCHOTERMAN, J.A. Ed. 1988. *Kubjikāmatatantra: Kulālikāmnāya Version. Critical Edition*. Leiden: Brill.

GOUGH, E. Kathleen. 1993. "The Nayars and the Definition of Marriage". In UBEROI 1993, 237–256.

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

GRIERSON, Sir George, assisted by Mukundarāma Śāstrī of Śrīnagar. 1915. *A Dictionary of the Kāshmīrī Language compiled partly from materials left by the late Paṇḍit Īśvara Kaula.* Bibliotheca Indica, New Series, No. 1405. Hertford: ASB, 1915. Reproduced, Delhi: Low Price Publications, 1993.

HALL, K.R. 1985. *Maritime Trade and State Development in Early Southeast Asia.* Sydney: Allen and Unwin.

—— 2001. "Merchants, Rulers, and Priests in an Early South Indian Sacred Centre: Cidambaram in the Age of the Cōlās". In Kenneth R. Hall (ed.), *Structure and Society in Early South India. Essays in Honour of Noboru Karashima* (New Delhi: Oxford University Press), 85–116.

HEFNER, Robert William. 1985. *Hindu Javanese: Tengger Tradition and Islam*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.

HENRY, Patricia B. 1986. *The Arjuna Wiwaaha.* Gaya: Centre for South East Asian Studies. The Old Javanese *Arjunawiwāha* of Mpu Kaṇva, Sargas 1–13; text, translation and commentary.

HIGHAM, Charles. 2001. *The Civilization of Angkor.* London: Weidenfeld and Nicholson.

HOBART et al. 2001: Angela Hobart, Urs Ramseyer and Albert Leeman, *The People of Bali*, Oxford: Blackwell (paperback edition). First published in hardback in 1996.

HOOYKAAS, C. 1964. *Agama Tirtha. Five studies in Hindu-Balinese religion.* Amsterdam: Noord-Hollandsche Uitgevers Maatschappji.

—— 1966. *Surya-sevana. The Way to God of a Balinese Siva Priest.* Amsterdam: Noord-Hollandsche Uitgevers Maatschappji.

—— 1974. *Cosmogony and Creation in Balinese Tradition.* The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff.

HUNTINGTON, Susan L. 1984. *The "Pāla-Sena" Schools of Sculpture.* Leiden: Brill.

IKARI, Yasuke. Ed. 1994. *A Study of the Nīlamata – Aspects of Hinduism in Ancient Kashmir.* Kyoto: Institute for Research in Humanities, Kyoto University.

ISWARANAND, S. 1995. *A Concise Dictionary Newar-English.* Kathmandu: Pilgrims Book House.

JACQUES, Claude. 1968. "Études d'épigraphie cambodgienne: 1. La stèle du Phnoṃ Srès (K. 1002)". *BEFEO* 54, 605–622.

—— 1976a. "À propos de l'esclavage dans l'ancien Cambodge". In Pierre-Bernard Lafont (ed.), *XXIXe Congrès International des Orientalistes. Asie du Sud-Est continental*, vol. 1, Paris: L'Asiathèque, 1976, 71–76.

—— 1976b. "Études d'épigraphie cambodgienne: 9. La stèle du Baphûon, K. 583". *BEFEO* 63, 351–365.

—— with the collaboration of René DUMONT 1999. *Angkor.* Cologne: Könemann. English edition of *Angkor*, Paris: Bordas, 1990.

—— 2001 "Les noms posthumes des rois dans l'ancien Cambodge". In Marijke J. Klokke and Karel R. van Kooij (ed.), *Fruits of Inspiration. Studies in Honour of Prof. J.G. de Casparis* (Groningen: Egbert Forsten), 191–198.

JESSUP, Helen I. and ZÉPHIR, Thierry. 1997. *Angkor et dix siècles d'art khmer*, catalogue of an exhibition at the Galeries nationales du Grand Palais, Paris, 31 January to 26 May 1997 and the National Gallery of Art, Washington, 29 June to 28 September 1997, prepared under the direction of Helen I. Jessup and Thierry Zéphir. Paris: Éditions de la Réunion des musées nationaux.

KANE, P.V. 1930–1962. *History of Dharmaśāstra.* Government Oriental Series, Class B, 6. 5 volumes. Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute.

KARASHIMA, Noboru. 2001. *History and Society in South India. The Cholas to Vijayanagar, comprising* South Indian History and Society *(1984) and* Towards a New Formation *(1992).* Omnibus edition. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.

KERN, H. 1900. *Rāmāyaṇa kakawin, Oudjavaansch heldendicht.* The Hague: Nijhoff.

KILAM, Jia Lal. 1955. *A History of Kashmiri Pandits.* Srinagar: S.N. Dar.

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

KOUL Anand. 1991. *The Kashmiri Pandit*. Delhi: Utpal Publications. Reprinted from the edition of 1924 (Calcutta: Thacker Spink).

LESSING, F.D. and WAYMAN, A. Trans. 1980. *Introduction to the Buddhist Tantric Systems Translated from Mkhas grub rje's* Rgyud sde spyiḥi rnam par gźag pa rgyas par brjod *with Original Text and Annotation*. New York: Samuel Weiser. Reprint of the second edition (Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1980). First edition: The Hague, 1968.

LÉVI, Sylvain. 1905 (vols. 1–2), 1908 (vol. 3). *Le Népal. Étude historique d'un royaume hindou*. Annales du Musée Guimet, Bibliothèque d'études, 17–19.

LEVY, Robert I. 1990. *Mesocosm. Hinduism and the Organization of a Traditional Newar City in Nepal*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

LINROTHE, Rob. 1999. *Ruthless Compassion. Wrathful Deities in Early Indo-Tibetan Esoteric Buddhist Art*. London: Serindia.

LOBO, Wibke. 1997. "L'image de Hevajra et le bouddhisme tantrique". In JESSUP and ZÉPHIR 1997, 71–78.

MABBETT, Ian and CHANDLER, David. 1996. *The Khmers*. The Peoples of South-East Asia and the Pacific. Oxford: Blackwell.

MADAN, T.N. 1989. *Family and Kinship: A Study of the Pandits of Rural Kashmir*. Delhi: Oxford University Press. Second, enlarged edition.

MAJUMDAR, R.C. 1985. *The Inscriptions of Champa*, Book III in *Champā. History and Culture of an Indian Colonial Kingdom in the Far East, 2nd.–16th Century A.D.*, Delhi: Gian, a omnibus reprint of *Ancient Indian Colonies in the Far East, Champa*, 1927.

MALLERET, Louis. 1960. "Contribution à l'étude du thème des Neuf Divinités dans la sculpture du Cambodge et du Champa". *Arts Asiatique* 7, 205–230.

MANANDHAR, Thakur Lal. 1986. *Newari-English Dictionary. Modern Language of Kathmandu Valley*. Ed. Anne Vergati. Delhi: Agam Prakashan.

MANGUIN, Pierre-Yves. 1979. "L'introduction de l'Islam au Campa." *BEFEO* 66: 255–269.

MEISTER, Michael W. et al. Ed. 1983–91. *Encyclopaedia of Indian Temple Architecture*. Delhi: American Institute of Indian Studies, Oxford University Press. Vol. 1, Part 1: *South India, Lower Draviḍadeśa 200* B.C.–A.D. *1324* (1983); Vol. 1, Part 2: *South India, Upper Draviḍadeśa, Early Phase* A.D. *550–1075* (1986); Vol. 2, Part 1: *North India, Foundations of North Indian Style, c. 250* B.C.–A.D. *1100* (1988); Vol. 2, Part 2: *North India, Period of Early Maturity, c.* A.D. *700–900* (1991).

—— Ed. 1984. *Discourses on Śiva: Proceedings of a Symposium on the Nature of Religious Imagery*. Pennsylvania: University of Pennsylvania Press.

MICHAELS, Axel. 1984. "Śiva's Wild and Wayward Calf – The Goddess Vatsalā, her Temple and Yātrā". *Kailash* XI.3–4 : 105–147.

—— 1994. *Die Reisen der Götter. Der nepalische Paśupatinātha-Tempel und sein rituelles Umfeld*. Nepalica, 6. Bonn: VGM Wissenschaftsverlag. With a supplementary volume: Axel Michaels and Govinda Tandan with drawings by Harald Fritzenkötter, *Paśupatikṣetra: Maps of Deopatan*.

MIKSIC, John N. and SOEKATNO, Sri Hardiati (ed.). 1995. *The Legacy of Majapahit*. Exhibition Catalogue. Singapore: National Museum of Singapore.

MIRASHI, V.V. 1962. "Gwalior Museum Stone Inscription of Pataṅgaśambhu". *Journal of the Madhya Pradesh Itihasa Parishad* 64, 3–13.

MISHRA, Abhaya Nath. 1984. *Shrotriyas of Mithila*. Bhadaini-Varanasi: Kishor Vidya Niketan.

MUS, Paul. 1933. "L'Inde vue de l'Est : Cultes indiens et indigènes du Champa". *BEFEO* 33, 1: 367–410.

NESBITT, H.J. 1997. "Constraints to Rice Production and Strategies for Improvement". In H.J. Nesbitt, (ed.), *Rice Production in Cambodia*, Manilla: International Rice Research Institute.

O'MALLEY, L.S.S. 1907. *Bengal District Gazetteers: Muzaffarpur*. Calcutta: The Bengal Secretariat Book Depot.

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

OZHA, Vajeshankar G. 1889. Ed. and trans. "The Somanāthpattan Praśasti of Bhāva Bṛhaspati. With an introduction by G. Bühler". *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Morgenlandes* 3: 1–19.

PARMU, R.K. 1969. *A History of Muslim Rule in Kashmir 1320–1819*. Delhi: People's Publishing House.

PELLIOT 1903. "Le Fou-nan". *BEFEO* 3, 258–303.

—— Trans. 1951. *Œuvres posthumes de P. Pelliot, Part 3: Mémoires sur les coutumes du Cambodge de Tcheou Ta-kouan: version nouvelle suivie d'un commentaire inachevé*. Paris: Adrien Maisonneuve. Revised and expanded edition of the original translation published in 1902 (*BEFEO* 2, 123–177).

PETECH, Luciano. 1984. *Medieval History of Nepal (c. 750–1482)*. Second, thoroughly revised edition. Serie Orientale Roma, 54. Rome: IIMEE.

PIGEAUD, Th. 1960–63. *Java in the fourteenth century; a study in cultural history; The Nāgarakertāgama by Rakawi Prapañca of Majapahit, 1365 A.D.* Vol 1: Javanese texts in transcription; Vol. 2: Notes on the texts and the translation; Vol. 3: Translations; Vol. 4: Commentaries and recapitulation; vol. 5: Glossary, general index. KITLV, Translation Series, 4. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff.

—— 1967. *Literature of Java*. Vol. I. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff.

PO DHARMA, 2001. "The History of Champa". In Emmanuel Guillon, *Cham Art. Treasures from the Dà Nang Museum, Vietnam* (Bangkok: River Books), 14–27.

POERBATJARAKA, Raden Mas Ngabei. 1926. *Agastya in den Archipel*. Leiden: Brill.

POU, Saveros. 1989. *Nouvelles inscriptions du Cambodge I*. Collection de textes et documents sur l'Indochine XVII. Paris: EFEO.

—— 1992. *Dictionnaire vieux khmer-français-anglais*. Bibliothèque Khmère, Série B: Travaux et Recherches, III. Paris: Cedoreck.

—— Ed. and trans. 2001. *Nouvelles inscriptions du Cambodge II & III*. Collection de textes et documents sur l'Indochine XXII–XXIII. Paris: EFEO.

RAMESH, K.V. and TEWARI, S.P. 1990. *A Copper-plate Hoard of the Gupta Period from Bagh, Madhya Pradesh*. New Delhi: Archaeological Survey of India.

REGMI, D.R. 1965–66. *Medieval Nepal*, 4 vols. Calcutta: Firma K.L. Mukhopādhyāya, 1965 (vol. 1), 1966 (vols. 2–4).

REID, Anthony. 1988. *Southeast Asia in the Age of Commerce 1450–1680, Volume One: The Lands below the Winds*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

—— 1993. *Southeast Asia in the Age of Commerce 1450–1680, Volume Two: Expansion and Crisis*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

RENOU, Louis. 1984. *Grammaire sanscrite*. Paris: Maisonneuve.

RICKLEFS, M.C. 1993. *War, Culture and Economy in Java 1677–1726. Asian and European Imperialism in the early Kartasura period*. Asian Studies Association of Australia, Southeast Asia Publication Series, No. 24. Sydney: Allen and Unwin.

ROBSON, Stuart (tr.). 1995. *Deśawarṇana (Nāgarakṛtāgama) by Mpu Prapañca*. Verhandelingen van het Koninklijk Instituut voor Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde 169. Leiden: KITLV Press.

RUEGG, David Seyfort. 1969. *La théorie du Tathāgatagarbha et du Gotra. Études sur la Sotériologie et la Gnoséologie du Bouddhisme*. Publications de l'EFEO, vol. 70. Paris: EFEO.

SALOMON, Richard. 1998. *Indian Epigraphy. A Guide to the Study of Inscriptions in Sanskrit, Prakrit, and the Other Indo-Aryan Languages*. New York: Oxford University Press.

SANDERSON, Alexis. 1988. "Śaivism and the Tantric Traditions". In S. Sutherland, L. Houlden, P. Clarke and F. Hardy (ed.), *The World's Religions*, London: Routledge, pp. 660–704. Reprinted in F. Hardy (ed.), *The World's Religions. The Religions of Asia*, London: Routledge, 1990, pp. 128–172.

—— 1990. "The Visualization of the Deities of the Trika". In A. Padoux (ed.), *L'Image Divine : Culte et Méditation dans l'Hindouisme*. Paris: Éditions du CNRS, pp. 31–88.

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

—— 1995. "Meaning in Tantric Ritual". In A.-M. Blondeau and K. Schipper (eds), *Essais sur le Rituel III: Colloque du Centenaire de la Section des Sciences religieuses de l'École Pratique des Hautes Études*. Louvain-Paris: Peeters, pp. 15–95.

—— 2001. "History Through Textual Criticism in the Study of Śaivism, the Pañcarātra and the Buddhist Yoginītantras". In François Grimal (ed.), *Les Sources et le temps. Sources and Time. A Colloquium, Pondicherry, 11–13 January 1997* (Publications du Département d'Indologie, 91. Pondicherry, Institut Français de Pondichéry / EFEO), pp. 1–47.

—— 2002. "Remarks on the Text of the Kubjikāmata". *Indo-Iranian Journal* 45, 1–24.

SANTIKO, Hariani. 1995. "Early Research on Sivaitic Hinduism during the Majapahit Era" (an abridged translation from Indonesian by J.N. Miksic). In MIKSIC and SOEKATNO 1995, 55–70.

SCHNITGER, F.M. 1937. *The Archaeology of Hindoo Sumatra*. Internationales Archiv für Ethnographie, Band 35, Supplement. Leiden: Brill.

SCHWEYER, Anne-Valérie. 1999. "Chronologie des inscriptions publiées du Campā. Études d'épigraphie cam I". *BEFEO* 86, 321–344.

SHARMA, Dasharatha. 1959. *Early Chauhān Dynasties. A Study of Chauhān Political History, Chauhān Political Institutions and Life in the Chauhān Dominions from c. 800 to 1316 A.D.*. Delhi: S. Chand.

SHEA, David and TROYER, Anthony. Trans. 1937. *Oriental Literature or the Dabistan*. New York, Tudor. A reprint, with an introduction by A.V. Williams Jackson of the edition of 1843: *The Dabistan or School of Manners translated from the original Persian with notes and illustrations*, 3 volumes, Paris: Oriental Translation Fund of Great Britain and Ireland. A translation of the *Kitab-i Dabistan-i Mazahib* attributed to Muhsin Fānī (17th century).

SIRCAR, D.C. 1976. "Indological Notes: R.C. Majumdar's Chronology of the Pāla Kings". *Journal of Ancient Indian History* 9 (1975–76), 209–210.

—— Ed. 1983. *Select inscriptions bearing on Indian History and Civilization. From the Sixth to the Eighteenth Century A.D.* Volume 2. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.

SLUSSER, M.S. 1982. *Nepal Mandala. A Cultural Study of the Kathmandu Valley*. Volume 1. Princeton: New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

SMITH, V.A. 1917. *Akbar, the Great Mogul, 1542–1605*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

SOEBADIO, Haryati. Ed. and trans. 1971. *Jñānasiddhānta*. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff. Sanskrit and Old Javanese.

—— Ed. 1992. *Pusaka. Art of Indonesia from the Collections of the National Museum*. Singapore: Archipelago Press.

SOEKMONO, R. 1990. "Indonesian Architecture of the Classical Period: a Brief Survey". In FONTEIN 1990, pp. 67–95. Translated from Indonesian by Jan Fontein.

SOTHEBY'S. 1995. *Indian and Southeast Asian Art with property from the Mr. and Mrs. Klaus G. Perls Collections. Sale 6741*. Catalogue, Auction of September 21, 1995.

STEIN, M.A. 1961. *Kalhaṇa's Rājataraṅgiṇī. A Chronicle of the Kings of Kaśmīr. Translated with an Introduction, Commentary and Notes*. 2 Volumes. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass. Reprinted from the edition of 1900.

STUART-FOX, David J. 2002. *Pura Besakih. Temple, Religion and Society in Bali*. Verhandelingen van het Koninklijk Instituut voor Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde. Leiden: KITLV Press.

SULEIMAN Satyawati. 1977. "The Archaeology and History of West Sumatra", *Berita Pusat Penelitan Purbakala dan Peninggalan Nasional* 12.

SUPOMO, S. Ed. and trans. 1977. *Arjunawijaya. A Kakawin of Mpu Tantular*. Vol. 1: Introduction and Text; Vol. 2: Translation. Bibliotheca Indonesica, 14. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff.

TAKAKUSU, Junjiro and WATANABE Kaigyoku. 1924–1929. *Taishō Issaikyō Kankōkai*. The Chinese Buddhist Canon.

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

TAMOT, Kashinath et al. 2000. *A Dictionary of Classical Newari Compiled from Manuscript Sources*. Kathmandu: Nepal Bhasa Dictionary Committee.

TANDAN, Govinda. 1996. *Paśupatikṣetrako Sāṅskritika Adhyayana*. Kathmandu: Jharendra Shumsher Jang Bahadur Rana and Manju Rana.

—— 1999. *Paśupatikṣetrako Sāṅskritika Adhyayana (Duï Bhāga), Abhilekha Khaṇḍa*. Kathmandu: Jharendra Shumsher Jang Bahadur Rana and Manju Rana. Document volume to accompany TANDAN 1996.

TARLING, Nicholas. Ed. 1992. *The Cambridge History of Southeast Asia. Volume One. From Early Times to c. 1800*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

TAYLOR, Keith W. 1992. "The Early Kingdoms". In TARLING 1992, 137–182.

TOD, James. 1920: William Crooke (ed. with introd. and notes), *Annals and Antiquities of Rajasthan or the Central and Western Rajput States of India*. 3 volumes. London: Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press, 1920. First edition: James Tod, *Annals and Antiquities of Rajasthan*. 2 vols. London: Higginbotham and Co., 1829 and 1832.

TRIMINGHAM, J. Spencer. 1973. *The Sufi Orders in Islam*. London: Oxford University Press.

TRIPĀṬHĪ, Ramā Śaṅkar. 1971. *Descriptive Catalogue of Samskrit Manuscripts in Gaekwada Library, Bharat Kalā Bhavana and Samskrit Mahāvidyālaya Library, Banaras Hindu University*. Banaras Hindu University Saṃskrit Series, Vol. 6. Varanasi: Banaras Hindu University.

TRAUTMANN, Thomas R. 1993a. "The Study of Dravidian Kinship". In UBEROI 1993, pp. 74–90.

—— 1993b. "Marriage Rules and Patterns of Marriage in the Dravidian Kinship Region". In UBEROI 1993, pp. 273–286.

UBEROI, Patricia. Ed. 1993. *Family, Kinship and Marriage in India*. Delhi: Oxford University Press.

UNESCO. 1999. *Champasak Heritage Management Plan*. Govt. of the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Ministry of Information and Culture. Bangkok: UNESCO.

VAJRĀCĀRYA, Gautamavajra. 1976. *Hanumān Ḍhokā Rājdarbār*. Kathmandu: Nepālar Eśiyālī Adhyayan Saṃsthān, Tribhuvan Viśvavidyālaya.

VAJRĀCĀRYA, Dhanavajra. 1973 [VS 2030]. *Licchavikālakā Abhilekha, anuvāda, aitihāsika vyākhyā sahita*. Kathmandu: Nepāl ra Eśiyālī Adhyayan Saṃsthān, Tribhuvan Viśvavidyālaya.

VERGATI, Anne 1995. *Gods, Men and Territory. Society and Culture in Kathmandu Valley*. New Delhi: Manohar.

VICKERY, Michael. 1998. *Society, Economics and Politics in Pre-Angkor Cambodia. The 7th–8th Centuries*. Tokyo: The Toyo Bunko.

VIVANTI, Pia. Ed. and trans. 1975. *Il "Kiraṇāgama": Testo e traduzione del "Vidyāpāda"*. Supplemento n. 3 agli Annali: vol. 35 (1975). fasc. 2. Napoli: Istituto Orientale di Napoli.

WRIGHT, D. Ed. 1877. *History of Nepal* (translated from the Parbatiya by Shew Shunker Singh and Pandit Gunanand; with an introductory sketch of the country and people of Nepal by the editor, Daniel Wright). London: Cambridge University Press. A translation of the Buddhist recension of the *Vaṃśāvalī* or genealogical history of Nepal.

YOKOCHI, Yuko. 1999a. "The Warrior Goddess in the *Devīmāhātmya*". In Masakazu Tanaka and Musashi Tachikawa (ed.), *Living with* Śakti. *Gender, Sexuality and Religion in South Asia*. Senri Ethnological Studies, No. 50. Osaka: National Museum of Ethnology.

—— 1999b. "Mahiṣāsuramardinī Myth and Icon: Studies in the *Skandapurāṇa*, II". In *Studies in the History of Indian Thought (Indo-Shishōshi Kenkyū)* 11. Kyoto: Association for the Study of the History of Indian Thought.

ZANEN, S.M. 1986. "The Goddess Vajrayoginī and the Kingdom of Sankhu (Nepal)". *Puruṣārtha* 10, 125–66.

ZHOU DAGUAN. See PELLIOT 1951.

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

58

ZOETMULDER, P.J. (with the collaboration of S.O. ROBSON). 1982. *Old Javanese-English Dictionary*. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff.

Editorial Conventions

When I have emended the reading of a manuscript or printed edition cited in the notes and when I have preferred the reading of one manuscript or group of manuscripts I have marked the beginning of the text-segment in question with a superscript asterisk. The end of the segment is followed by a parenthesis in which first the status of the segment is indicated, by "em." for an emendation, "corr." for an obvious correction, "conj." for a conjectural emendation, or, if it is an attested reading, an upper-case letter or letters identifying the manuscript or manuscripts in which it is transmitted. The manuscripts to which these letters refer have been identified in the bibliographical entry for that text. Any testimonia relevant to the emendation or choice of reading have been indicated thereafter within square brackets. Then, after a colon, are given the readings that have been rejected. Where more than one rejected reading has been cited the later is separated from the preceding by a colon. Rejected readings are followed in every case by their source, either the letter or letters identifying the manuscript source, "Cod." for the manuscript when only one has been available, "Codd." when there is more than one and all give the reading, or "Ed." when the source is a printed edition identified in the bibliography. When the reported reading of an inscription has been questioned its source has been indicated by the abbreviation "Ep." The same conventions have been followed where text has been presented in the form of an indented citation within the main text rather than in the notes, except that emendations, variants and the rest have been given not within the citation, as in the notes, but in a register below it. The beginnings of the text-segments concerned have not been marked with a superscript asterisk because they have been given in the lower register at the beginning of each entry. I have enclosed problematic text-segments between obeli. In my transcriptions the character Upadhmānīya is rendered *f*.